Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2012 with funding from
Research Library, The Getty Research Institute

http://archive.org/details/upontreatiseentit00brya

OBSERVATIONS

UPON

A TREATISE,

ENTITLED

A DESCRIPTION OF THE PLAIN OF TROY,

BY

Monſieur le CHEVALIER.

By JACOB BRYANT.

ETON:
Printed by M. POTE, 1795.
Sold by Meſſrs. CADELL and DAVIES, *Strand*, LONDON.

Publiſhed by the ſame Author,

A TREATISE upon the Truth of the Chriſtian Religion.

And,

A TREATISE upon the Miracles in Egypt, and the Divine Miſſion of Moſes.

THE

PREFACE.

THE following TREATISE *was taken in hand, when the Deſcription of the Plain of* Troy *firſt came out. For as I had written upon the ſame ſubject, and concerning the Trojan War, and as there were ſome articles contrary to my opinion in the Deſcription; it ſeemed to me by no means improper, to obviate the objections, which might ariſe, ſhould my thoughts be ever made publick. And as a ſecond Edition of this Work has been publiſhed, and probably is by this time ſold, it appeared to be a proper ſeaſon to ſend this Treatiſe into the World. For I ſhould be willing to take off all undue impreſſions; that if my other Treatiſe, of more conſequence than the preſent, ſhould come forth, my proceſs may be freed, if poſſible, from all impediment and objections.*

THE

INTRODUCTION.

MR. DALZEL, the Tranſlator and Editor of the Deſcription, gives the Author Mr. le CHEVALIER a very excellent character, as being diſtinguiſhed by the variety *of his Knowledge, the vivacity of his Converſation, and the agreableneſs of his Manners:* of which I make no doubt: And we may preſume, that the Perſon muſt be bleſt with the ſame Knowledge and happy attainments, who could draw ſo fair a Picture. But theſe learned Gentlemen ſhould have conſidered, that, however they may have been gifted with Knowledge, and with accuracy equal to that Knowledge, yet miſtakes will ſometimes happen: and they ſhould ſhew the greateſt candour and moderation to others, that the like return may be made to them.

This I mention, becauſe there certainly is not that lenity, and mildneſs preſerved, which their beſt Friends might have wiſhed, and even an enemy expected. This will appear from the paſſages annexed, which will ſhew that they have not been

ſufficiently upon their guard. And though ſome compliments are caſually introduced, yet they are in a manner cancelled by the antecedent ſeverity.

Of unneceſſary critical Cenſure.

It is ſaid of Dr. Pococke, that his account of Troas *is full of errors, and obſcure*, p. 51. *That he ſuffered himſelf to be miſled by Strabo, rather than truſt to his own eyes*, p. 51. He is accuſed of *diffidence and reſerve, and exceſſive caution: by which he expoſed others to the cenſure of temerity, when they were to hold that for certain, which he had only conſidered, as probable.* p. 101. This is an article of accuſation, which I do not quite underſtand. If he was cautious, and they raſh, it was, I ſhould think, their fault, and not his, if any miſtake enſued. Though ſo little is produced in the Diſſertation to his advantage, yet we are told in the Notes, (p. 100) that *his merit is there over-rated,---he is ſo very deficient in compoſition----in arrangement----and his ideas are ſo confuſed. It is a matter of regret, that he ſhould not have been able to tell diſtinctly, what he ſaw.* p. 101. This is hard dealing with a perſon, of whom the celebrated Traveller Niebuhr, and many other unexceptionable Judges have entertained a far better opinion. What may ſeem extraordinary, the Author of the Treatiſe himſelf ſtyles him----*that excellent Traveller*, and owns his obligations to him, p. 100, for *he proved to him a very uſeful guide in his reſearches*, p. 51, and even mentions him *as a ſure guide*, p. 76. How a perſon, that was ſo excellent, and of ſuch benefit, could be ſo deficient, ſo confuſed, and not able to expreſs his mind, nor to ſee with

with his own eyes, in ſhort ſo full of errors, is paſt my comprehenſion. I only can ſay, if he was of ſuch ſervice, he deſerved better treatment.

Mr. Wood is repreſented---as void of all merit---*negligent*, *obſtinate*, *arrogant*, and *abſurd*. p. 56, 59, 75, ſee p. 80 in particular. He was continually bewildered, and turned all things into Chaos and [1] confuſion, p. 51, 79, 80, 100. He is ſaid p. 57, *to have deſerved no mercy:* and certainly no mercy has he found.

Dr. Chandler is treated with ſome deference: yet he finally meets with his ſhare of cenſure. As Dr. Pococke was blamed for his diffidence, ſo Dr. Chandler is accuſed of *confidence, and eaſe:* which by the explanation falls little ſhort of preſumption, indolence and aſſurance. For he is ſaid *to have impoſed upon the credulity of his Readers, and to have ſuppoſed, that they would adopt, without any proof, whatever he was pleaſed to ſay.* p. 55, and 101. But this treatment cannot be eſteemed liberal: and ſhould never have proceeded from a Perſon of learning and humanity.

Strabo is repeatedly cenſured: all that he knew concerning *Troy*, is ſaid to have been *borrowed from one Demetrius of Scepſis*, p. 49, 57. He is mentioned, as *erroneous, and obſcure*, p. 58, 59, 60: *who led others* into many *errors* and *abſurdities*; and who *never had viſited the place* which he deſcribed. p. 48, 49, and Notes 59.

[1] P. 75. It is here ſaid—*Mr. Wood has viewed the Troade erroneouſly.* P. 77. Notes—Mention is made of *Mr. Wood's own exact deſcription of the Coaſt.* A Man ſo erroneous and ſo accurate was never before ſeen.

This

This ſeverity was unfortunate; and cannot be obſerved without concern, when we conſider, from whom it proceeded. And I hope, that I ſhall be excuſed, if I preſume to point out any defects in the opinions of theſe learned Gentlemen. For they cannot be offended with a liberty, which they themſelves have taken, eſpecially if they are addreſſed with that candour and urbanity, to which every man of learning has a claim.

OBSERV-

OBSERVATIONS

UPON

A TREATISE, &c.

The Situation of Troy.

MR. le CHEVALIER has uſed great diligence in traverſing the region of Troas: and has made many obſervations, which may deſerve the notice of the World. Yet I cannot help thinking, that his zeal has ſometimes tranſported him too far, and that there is not always that certainty in his determinations, which through prejudice, he imagined. It is my fear that he is fundamentally miſtaken in reſpect to the ſituation of Troy; and that it does not by any means agree with the deſcription given by Homer; nor with many circumſtances in the courſe of the Poem. The City, deſcribed by the Author, of the Treatiſe, ſeems to be placed far too remote from the ναυσαθμος, and camp of the Grecians, upon the ſea. Hence the marches, and countermarches, and other operations carried on to ſuch a diſtance in that interval of ground, cannot be made to agree with the time allotted for them. He ſpeaks of the Village *Bounarbachi* (p. 116) as being four leagues, near twelve miles, from the ſea. From this place he aſcended for a mile, till he arrived at a lofty eminence, ſurrounded for the moſt part with abrupt precipices: (p. 127) and upon this hill he ſuppoſes the Troy of Homer to have been founded. The neareſt part of the City muſt therefore have been thirteen miles from the

the coaſt, and the ſhips of the Grecians. The Citadel called *Pergamus* muſt have been ſtill farther, as may be ſeen in the Maps of the Author, (p. 1, and 115.) Now this interval between the Camp and the City ſeems to be far too great for the Grecians to have advanced to it with labour, and by degrees forced their way to the walls, and then to have gradually retreated, when we conſider the time allotted for thoſe operations. Let us take for example the diſtant movements upon that day, when Patroclus is ſaid to have been ſlain. It is mentioned in the eleventh book of the Poem, that the Greeks iſſued from their tents in the morning, and engaged the Trojans, who had kept their ſtation during the night επι θρωσμῳ πεδιοιο. Λ. v. 56.

This was a part of the Plain, of which I ſhall ſay more hereafter. The Author places it in his Map about the diſtance of a mile: and it is deſcribed by the Poet, as ολιγος χωρος (κ. v. 60) *a ſmall ſpace of land.* The engagement began, and was carried on very ſtubbornly till the third, or fourth hour after ſun-riſe, without either ſide giving way. But, when the ſun was got ſomewhat high in the firmament, and according to the ancient way of reckoning, the hind and woodman had made their firſt meal or breakfaſt, the Trojans were obliged to give way.

Τημος σφῃ αρετῃ Δαναοι ῥηξαντο φαλαγγας
Τρωων------Λ. 90.

At that time the Grecians by dint of proweſs diſordered, and broke through the array of the Trojans, who accordingly retreated. They however continually faced about, till they were driven beyond the Tomb of Ilus, and the Ερινεος, or wild Fig-tree, quite up to the Scæan gate, where they made a ſtand.

Αλλ' οτε δη Σκαιας τε πυλας και φηγον ικοντο,
Ενθ' αρα δη ιϛαντο-----

This according to the [1] ſtatement and delineation of Monſ. C. could not be leſs than thirteen miles from the ſhips, and coaſt. Agamemnon is here

[1] P. 27, and 116.

wounded,

wounded, and retires: upon which Hector encourages the Trojans, who in their turn drive the enemy quite back to the rampart. Here a very ſharp fight commences: but the Greeks are ſtill worſted, and one of the ſhips fired. From the City to the ſhipping was an additional ſpace of thirteen miles=26. At this juncture Patroclus is ſent in the armour of Achilles, who drives away the Trojans back to the very walls of their City, after they had been for a long time in poſſeſſion of the rampart. This was however effected by degrees.

Ου γαρ πω τι Τρωες αρηιφιλων υπ' Αχαιων
Προτροπαδην φοβεοντο μελαιναων απο νηων,
'Αλλ' ετ' αρ' ανθιϛαντο, νεων δ' υποειχον αναγκη. Il. Π. 300.

Nothing hindered Patroclus from taking the City by ſtorm, but the interpoſition of the tutelary Deity. For he is ſaid to have made four attempts to ſcale the wall: and ſeems to have three times got nearly upon it, but was driven off by the [1] guardian of the place. In the mean time *Hector ſheltered himſelf, and his horſes, under the Scæan gate.*

'Εκτωρ δ' ἐν Σκαιῃσι πυλαις εχε μωνυχας ἱππους. Π. 711. Hence it is plain, that they had paſſed from the ſtation of the ſhips quite up to the walls of the City another 13 miles=39. Patroclus is here ſlain, and Hector again takes the lead: and drives the Grecians back to their entrenchment, though not without great oppoſition, and delay. Here we have another addition of thirteen miles to be noticed: and the aggregate of the whole is fifty two miles: and theſe flights and countermarches are for the moſt part performed between the third, and the twelfth hour of the day: from about nine in the morning to ſix o'clock in the afternoon. But this is incredible, and impoſſible. And ſhould we, to prevent the overrating of the diſtance, deduct eight or ten miles; yet the fact would be ſtill impoſſible. Without conſidering the great fatigue, and delay in ſtubborn conteſt, few men, however expedite, and lightly equipped, could ſingly walk over ſuch a ſpace of ground in nine or ten hours; much leſs an army

[1] Τρις μεν επ' αγκωιος ξη τειχεος ὑψηλοιο,
Πατροκλος, τρις δ' αυτον επεϛιφυλιξεν Απολλων. Π. 752.

of an hundred thouſand men. The City therefore, as deſcribed by Homer, muſt have been much nearer: and the ſituation given to Troy by Mr. C. is contrary to the very evidence of the Poet.

Of the uncertainty of Authors in reſpect to the diſtance of ſome principal objects.

As the camp of the Grecians was a naval ſtation, it is highly neceſſary, if poſſible, to aſcertain the part of the coaſt, upon which it is deſcribed in the Poem; as the ſituation of Troy muſt in a great meaſure be determined from it. It has been generally ſuppoſed, that this camp was upon the Helleſpont, and extended from the Sigean Promontory to the Rhœtean, and that the ſtation of Achilles was at the former, and that of Ajax at the latter place. It is alſo further ſaid, that each of theſe Heroes was buried near the particular promontory, where they had been ſtationed. Theſe were the limits, and abutments of the Grecian camp according to both the modern and the ancient Writers upon the ſubject. But neither of theſe Promontories, eſpecially the Rhœtean, has been ever ſatisfactorily pointed out. This will appear from the different accounts of the diſtance, which is ſuppoſed to have ſubſiſted between them. Mr. Wood thinks, that the Rhœtean Promontory was the ſame as Cape Barbieri; which according to his map is not much leſs than ten miles from the Sigean, the ſame as cape Janiſary. Strabo makes the interval to be ſixty ſtadia; which amount to above ſeven miles: Solinus repreſents it as forty ſtadia; or near five miles. Pliny makes it thirty; about three miles and a half. Thus they varied concerning the interval, becauſe they had no certain boundaries, from whence they could draw a line: but each determined the two extremes according to their particular ſyſtem. If we attend to the Map given by the Author of the Deſcription, p. 102. the diſtance is ſomewhat ſhort of four miles: and in his thirteenth chapter he ſtates it at thirty furlongs, or ſomewhat more than three miles and a half. He accuſes Mr. Wood, as well as M. d' Anville, of being miſled by Strabo; and aſſerts, in order to ſhew the certainty of his obſervations, that he meaſured

it

it himſelf. *I was at the pains to aſcertain this diſtance geometrically, and found it to be three thouſand fathoms.* p. 102. But what was the object, of which he ſpeaks; and which he meaſured ſo accurately? An interval never defined; and determined by him from imaginary abutments, about which nobody could ever agree. He blames the ſtatement of others; and gives us his own meaſurement, which is equally precarious. He, however, deſcribes the ſtations of the principal perſons, after he has determined the camp, in the following manner. *The Tent of the Commander in chief occupied the center of the Camp: Achilles had his ſtation at the right wing, near the Sigean promontory; and Ajax at the left, near the Rhœtean.* That Ajax and Achilles, were at the extremes according to the Poet, is certain; but that they were bounded by the Rhœtean and Sigean promontories is a notion of later date. Nothing to this purpoſe is ſaid by Homer: no ſuch names are to be found in his writings. He was a ſtranger both to Rhœteum and Sigeum, of which the learned Author does not ſeem to have been appriſed.

His ſituation of the Grecian Camp wrong.

That the Author cannot be right in the ſituation of his camp may, I think, be proved from his Map, where the Scamander, and the mouth of it, called the Stomalimne, run through the Naval ſtation of the Greeks. This cut off all communication between one part of the army, and the other: for it muſt have been ever an impaſſable [1] barrier. There was no poſſibility of getting over this obſtruction. The Author is aware of this difficulty: and employs a whole page to obviate, or at leaſt extenuate, the evil, which cannot after all be remedied. He, however, forms many ſuppoſitions; which, I fear, are unavailing. He places the difficulty in a fair and ſtrong light; and owns, that, *on reflecting upon the inundations of the Simois, we ſhould think it ſtrange, that the army of the Greeks ſhould have pitched their camp upon ſuch diſadvantageous ground: and eſpecially that*

1. Of this opening, called Stomalimne, ſee Strabo, l. 13. p. 890. There appears alſo to have been a large bed of oaze, which was protruded far into the ſea, and was of a great breadth. It had the name of Palæſcamander, of which Pliny takes notice.—*Stagnum Palæſcamander.* l. v. c. 30.

they were able to maintain their ſtation on that ground for the ſpace of ten years. p. 103 To obviate theſe objections, he has recourſe to many expedients; which will not, I believe, be deemed competent. He accordingly intimates, that the Grecians might poſſibly have their camp, ſometimes in a different place: a circumſtance never before thought of by any perſon, either ancient, or modern. For—*though the war continued ſo many years, it does not appear from Homer, that the Greeks were encamped between the Sigean and Rhœtean promontories all that time.* p. 103. As I have ſaid before, there is not a word in Homer about theſe promontories: but that the army was encamped before the City all that time we may be aſſured from many paſſages both in the Ilias and Odyſſea: alſo by that negative proof, that no other encampment was ever in the leaſt intimated. But we have poſitive proof: for the chief expeditions made to other places were under Achilles, which are mentioned. Iliad. I. 326. Odyſſ. T. 105. and at theſe times we are told in expreſs terms, that Agamemnon, and conſequently the main army, remained inactive before Troy. Achilles ſays, that upon his return he preſented the General with the plunder.

----Ὁ δ' οπισθε μενων παρα νηυσι θοῃσι
Δεξαμενος, δια παυρα δασασκεθο-----Il. I. v. 332.

The grand army was never upon any of theſe expeditions: but all the time in its naval encampment.

After many ſuppoſitions in conſequence of a pleaſing prejudice, he ſays, that *at laſt*, in the tenth year, they came to the mouth of the River, at a ſeaſon, when the Simois was dry, p. 104. In the firſt place there is not the leaſt evidence for this notion about their coming here firſt in the tenth year. And how could the drying up of the brook Simois above, affect the mouth of the Scamander, and the marſh below, which was inundated by the ſea? No river that thus empties itſelf into the deep, ever fails at its mouth, nor are its marſhes dry, for they are repleniſhed with ſalt-water: and of this we are certified, concerning this place, by [1] Strabo. This therefore could

1. L. 13. p. 890. Στομαλιμνη—Palæſcamander of Pliny, L. v. c. 39. p.

not

not have been the ſituation of the Camp; as all communication between one part of the army, and the other, muſt have been entirely interrupted. If one wing had been attacked, no aſſiſtance could have been afforded by the other. A Camp with an impaſſable moraſs in the middle was never thought of before. Pliny ſpeaks of the Scamander, as *amnis navigabilis*, l. 5. p. 822. Who ever heard, that the mouth of a navigable river was ever deſtitute of water, or that its moraſſes and ſalt marſhes were dry? This ſuppoſition therefore is merely formed to obviate an inſuperable objection: and conſequently is not adequate. Such a ſituation muſt have been likewiſe the moſt unhealthy, that could have been choſen. And here it is to be obſerved, that the Author, and his Editor, in the Map of Troy, call the Marſh Stomalimne by a peculiar interpretation—*The Marſh of Stoma.* By this they ſeem to have taken the word στομα to have been a proper name; which is extraordinary. The Marſh had its name from its ſituation, being λιμνη προς στομα του ποταμου, *the Marſh at the mouth of the river*; which the Greeks expreſſed briefly στομαλιμνη. I ſay, it was denominated from it's ſituation, and not from the proper name either of man or place.

Since I wrote the above, I by chance looked into Strabo, and find that this miſtake is copied from the Latin verſion, where Stomalimne is moſt idly interpreted—*Palus nomine Stoma.* l. 13. p. 891. Alſo, p. 892, it is rendered as improperly—*Lacus cui Stoma nomen.* The learned Caſaubon is juſtly ſevere upon the Author of the Verſion; and mentions, that he had been guilty of the like miſtake in another place,—*inſignis Xylandri ſupinitas, qui vertit Os portûs, quaſi legendum eſſet* στομα λιμενος. The Author of the View ſhould have been more cautious, and not have taken the Latin verſion for a precedent.

Obſcurity, ariſing from the different accounts.

We have ſeen, how different the meaſurements are, which have been given for that interval, between the Rhœtean, and Sigean promontories. And not only their ſituation, but their identity, has not been determined. The Author, however, takes the loweſt eſtimate, in order to obviate ſome objections, which may be made: and ſays, that the diſtance amounted only to three thouſand fathoms, which is little more than three miles. But ſtill this will not remedy the difficulties, which ariſe, and which have been mentioned. They ſtill remain in full force. For if the diſtance from the right to the left of the army was after all ſo great, how could Agamemnon, when he called out from the ſhip in the center, be heard, as Homer tells us, to the two extremities. Θ. v. 222. How can any human voice in the midſt of ſhipping, and the din of war reach above a mile and an half each way, both to the right and to the left? It cannot be thought poſſible. This therefore according to the Poet could not be the ſituation of the Camp and Navy. This may be farther proved from the ſhips of Ajax and Proteſilaus, which were upon the left —

Ενθ' εσαν Αιαν]ος τε νεες, και Πρω]εσιλαω. N. 681.

Yet Achilles, whoſe ſtation was the very fartheſt upon the right, and as far again as that of Agamemnon, could perceive every thing which was done at the other extremity, at the time when Hector invaded that part of the camp. He ſaw the ſhip of Proteſilaus ſet on fire,—

Λευτσω δη ωαρα νηυσι ωυρος δηιοιο ερωην. Π. 127.

And, what is more, he heard the voice of Hector ſo plainly, as to diſtinguiſh it from that of any other General.

Ουδε ωω Ατρειδεω ονος εκλυον αυδησαντος
Εχθρης εκ κεφαλης· αλλ' Εκτορος ανδροφονοιο
Τρωσι κελευοντος ωεριαγνυ]αι.—Π. 70.

The diſtance could not be ſo great as it is repreſented by the Author. For, according to the plan laid down, it muſt have been above three miles.

miles. According to other accounts it appears to have been far more. But let a man's voice be ever ſo ſtrong, he will hardly be diſtinguiſhed a league off. The camp therefore could not have been of that extent, nor ſituated, where it is deſcribed.

Of the Θρωσμος πεδιε, *or Saltus Campeſtris.*

Homer in more places than one takes notice of the Trojans being encamped—επι Θρωσμῳ πεδιοιο; which the Author ſays in his Index was probably the Tomb of Ilus. And in his 112th. page; the words are by him interpreted—*cloſe upon the mound in the plain*; which mound he ſuppoſes to have been the tomb. But how could an army of fifty thouſand men encamp upon a ſepulchral monument, though it were as large as the Tomb of Mauſolus? The Author however, not attending to this, proceeds in his notion; and tries to confirm his argument, that *the* Θρωσμος *and the monument of Ilus were the ſame*, from the Expedition of Ulyſſes and Diomede.—*In their way* (Il. X. 414.) *they meet with Dolon, the Trojan ſpy, who in order to ſhun death, with which they threaten him, informs them, that the Trojans are really encamped in the neighbourhood, (as Neſtor had already told them) and that Hector is holding a Council with the Trojan Chiefs at the monument of Ilus.* He adds, *If the concurrence of theſe teſtimonies does not amount to a demonſtration, that the Throſmos and the Tomb of Ilus are the ſame, it is clear at leaſt, that theſe two monuments could not be at any great diſtance from each other*, p. 112. So far from any demonſtration ariſing from the ſuppoſed concurrence of circumſtances, there is not the leaſt ſhadow of probability. In the firſt place we have no intimation given, that by Θρωσμος was meant a monument, much leſs, that it was the Tomb ſuppoſed. In the next place, it is no where ſaid, that it was *cloſe upon it*. The words of the Poet concerning Hector are—

Βηλας βηλευει Θειε παρα σηματι Ιλε
Νοσφιν απο φλοισβε.—K. 415.

Hector is holding a Council at the Tomb of the noble Ilus; νοσφιν *apart, and at a diſtance from the noiſe of the Camp.* How a Perſon removing from one

one place to another more convenient, and being ſeparated, can make them both the ſame, or even near one another, I do not ſee. They probably choſe the tomb of Ilus rather than any vacant ſpot, on account of its ſanctity, to make their deliberations more awful and ſerious. The place is ſaid to have been νοσφιν, *apart, at ſome diſtance*: but, how great that diſtance was, can be only known from the context. It was ſufficiently remote to prevent the noiſe of the camp incommoding them: which noiſe was very great. This is plain from Agamemnon hearing it in the Grecian camp—

Αυλων, συριγγωντ' ενοπην, ὁμαδοντ' ανθρωπων. K. 13.

There is no reaſon to conclude from this deſcription, that the place of encampment and the Tomb of Ilus were very near, much leſs that they were the ſame. Some further intimation concerning them may be found L. xi. v. 166. The Trojans had been encamped επι θρωσμῳ (v 56.) and were there in the morning regularly drawn up in full array. After a very ſevere conflict they were driven from it, They accordingly fled away, and were purſued by Agamemnon, who ſlew great numbers of them in their flight.

Ατρειδης δ' επετο σφεδανον Δαναοισι κελευων·
Οι δε παρ' Ιλε σημα παλαιε Δαρδανιδαο,
Μεσσον καππεδιον παρ' ερινεον εσσευοντο
Ιεμενοι πολεως.----v. 165.

Agamemnon followed them, at the ſame time calling out to his own people to purſue. *In the mean while the Trojans preſſed forwards by the Tomb of Ilus in the midſt of the plain, and alſo by the Wild Fig-tree, ſtriving to get to the City.* If then the Tomb was in the middle of the plain higher up, and the Θρωσμος, as the Author allows, near the ſhipping, much below, they muſt neceſſarily have been two different objects, and by no means ſo near as might otherwiſe be ſuppoſed.

The word Θρωσμος is an antient term, which, I believe, does not occur in Homer above three times; and it occurs alſo in Apollonius Rhodius twice,

twice. Whether it is to be found elſewhere, I know not. The Commentators and Scholiaſts vary about its meaning, but for the moſt part ſuppoſe it to have been ὑψηλος τοπος βυνοειδης, *a kind of high conical mound:* others affect to determine it more preciſely by ſaying, that it was the ſame as Calicolone, or beautiful hill, upon which the Gods uſed to deſcend to take a view of the battle. This hill by the Scholiaſt, as well as by Strabo, is eſtimated as five ſtadia in circumference,---K. 160. Υ. 3. σταδιων πεντε την περιμετρον.---This does not amount to 1200 feet in diameter at the bottom: and as all conical hills gradually decreaſe towards the ſummit; the diameter and ſuperficial contents muſt be there far leſs: and the amount could not well be above twenty acres. But how can it be ſuppoſed, that the Trojan army, which in book 8th. v. 558. is eſtimated at fifty thouſand men, could encamp within ſuch a ſpace of ground: or upon any hill βυνοειδης? More eſpecially if we conſider their chariots and horſes, for they encamped συν ἱπποισιν και οχεσφιν, which muſt have demanded infinitely more room. The principal perſons who have given their opinion about this ancient term, are the Scholiaſts, Heſychius, Euſtathius and Suidas. But they were all a great many Centuries after the Poet, moſt of them above a thouſand years: and all that they have ſaid is mere matter of opinion, which is contradicted by the whole tenour of the Hiſtory.

Were I to ſpeak my mind, I ſhould imagine, that word Θρωσμος of the Grecians was perfectly analogous to the Saltus of the Romans. By the latter was meant a paſſage between woods, or hills, bounded by them on on each ſide: and anſwered in ſome degree to a lawn among the Engliſh: only it was generally more wide. We read of the Saltus Pyrenæi, Saltus Caſtulonenſis, Saltus Mauritaniæ, Saltus Vaſconum, Saltus Alpium: mentioned by Cæſar, Pliny and other Writers. Theſe were paſſages, Trajectus inter fauces et anguſtias Montium, which Generals uſed to endeavour timely to occupy. There were others between woods frequented by Hunters, Ovid mentions *ſaltus venantibus apti:* 5 Epiſt. 27. and Virgil ſpeaks of ſome as of great extent—*magnos canibus circumdare ſaltus.* 1. Georg. 140. Such I take the Θρωσμος to have been. The plain of

Troy

Troy reached upwards from the naval Station to the City, but in one part it was in ſome degree contracted by the hills on each ſide: yet not ſo much, but that it afforded full room for the Trojans to encamp. It muſt have been a place well adapted to that purpoſe, being a part of the riſing plain, but flanked on each ſide by the αγκωνες, ſome projected parts, or abutments of the Hills, which afforded great ſecurity. In conſequence of this we find that the Trojans were with difficulty driven from this ſtation, which was the firſt place of conſequence in the route from the Grecian Navy. The ſecond was the tomb of Ilus; next the Erineos: and laſt of all the φηγος or Beech at the Scæan Gate. The other objects mentioned in the courſe of the Poem lay not in this direct line. The two prominences mentioned above, as formed by the hills on each ſide of that part of the plain called Throſmos, are preciſely deſcribed by Strabo. He accordingly tells us, that from the Idean Mountains—δυο φησιν [1] αγκωνας εκτεινεσθαι προς την θαλατταν,---two elbows, like promontories, extended themſelves towards the ſea, but did not reach it, for where they ended downward, the city New Ilium was ſituated: but the original City according to his conception was at ſome diſtance above. Between theſe was the Trojan Camp, but low down in the plain.

Nector, when he calls up Diomede aſks him,----

Ουχ' αϊεις, ως Τρωες επι θρωσμιω πεδιοιο
Ειαται αγχι νεων, ολιγος δ' ετι χωρος ερυκει.---K. 160.

Do not you perceive that the Trojans are encamped upon the Saltus in the plains, and a very ſmall interval ſeparates them from us? In another place it is ſaid—

----------ὁτι δηιοι εγγυθι νηων
Καιεσι πυρα πολλα.---L. IX. 76.

The enemy has lighted up many fires very near to the Ships.

1 L. 13. p. 892. Αγχου is very improperly by the Tranſlator rendered Convallis. It means quite the contrary. Αγκος is a valley; but αγκων ſignifies a projection, like a man's elbow. It is ſaid of Patroclus—τρις μεν επ' αγκωνος βη πειχεος—IL. Π. v. 702. *He three times got upon a projecting part of the wall.* The word is uſed by Sophocles in the plural αγκωνες, which in the Scholia is very truly rendered —τας ακρας των ορων. Ajax Mafty. So alſo,—μεγας και ὑπειροχος αγκων Εξανεχει γαιης—. Apollon. Rhod, L. 2. v. 369. *a huge towering promontory roſe up in air.*

That

That I am not wrong in the ſituation, which I have given to the Trojan place of encampment, may be ſhew from other paſſages in the Poet. The Throſmos or Saltus Campeſtris, where the fires were lighted, was according to my opinion, a particular part of the plain of Troy. Homer ſpeaking of theſe fires ſays----Θ. v. 558.----

Χιλι' αρ' εν πεδιῳ πυρα καιετο, παρ δε ἑκαστῳ
Ειατο πεντηκοντα σελᾳ πυρος αιθομενοι.

We find, that theſe fires were all lighted up in the plain: there therefore muſt have been the encampment: and θρωσμος πεδιοιο was manifeſtly θρωσμος εν πεδιῳ. Hence it could not relate to any tumulus or τοπος βεμβελιδης. Had it been on a hill, Homer would never have ſaid that it was in a plain. I have likewiſe mentioned, that places of this nature were by their ſituation not only bounded on each ſide with hills or mountains, but oftentimes with woods and foreſts. That this part of the plain was between eminences of this ſort, I have ſhewn from the very nature of Saltus; and proved it from the evidence of Strabo. It is likewiſe manifeſt from the account given by the Poet, that it lay cloſe to ſome very extenſive woods: otherwiſe how could they upon ſuch a ſudden emergency have immediately procured fuel for a thouſand fires: eſpecially as each of theſe fires was ſo large, as to have fifty perſons repoſing themſelves round them. There muſt have been an ample foreſt to have afforded ſuch conveniences ſo ſoon. Such was the place of encampment, which the Trojans occupied, εγγυθι νηων.

Farther account of the City.

But however near to the Grecian Ships the Trojans may have encamped, they at the ſame time could not have been at any very great diſtance from the City The interval was by no means ſo large, as has been imagined; of which I have already produced proofs. It may be farther aſcertained from that paſſage in the Poet, where Hector orders proviſions to be brought from Troy to the encampment επι θρωσμῳ.

Εκ πολιος δ' αξασθε βοας, και ιφια μηλα
Καρπαλιμως, δινηλε μελιφρονα οινησεσθε. Θ. 505.

Bring immediately both Oxen and Sheep from the City: and procure a ſufficient quantity of Wine. We cannot ſuppoſe, that the General ſent for theſe articles ten or eleven miles, and that they were to be brought as many more to the camp. The flocks of ſheep would not at this rate have arrived before morning. The City therefore could not have been ſo far either from the Camp, or from the ſhips of the Grecians, as has been ſuppoſed.

But I need not have gone ſo far for my proofs, as the Poet in another place deſcribes the ſituation of Troy ſo plainly, that I ſhould have thought it could not be miſtaken The Author, as we have ſeen, places it above Bounarbachi, *an eminence of* [1] *Mount Ida*, ſurrounded with precipices, p. 27. and above four leagues from the ſea But in the twentieth book of the Poet, v. 215, we have a very different ſituation afforded.

Δαρδανον αν πρωτον τεκετο νεφεληγερετα Ζευς,
Κτισσε δε Δαρδανιην, επει ουπω Ιλιος ἱρη
Εν πεδιῳ πεπολιστο πολις μεροπων ανθρωπων,
Αλλ' εθ' ὑπωρειας ωκεον πολυπιδακος Ιδης.

The purport of this is, that Dardanus the ſon Jupiter, built the ancient City Dardania, which he intimates ſtood high up in the Country. Troy, ſays he, which is ſituated in the plain, was not yet founded: but people ſtill continued to reſide at the bottom of Mount Ida. Plato ſays, that they for ſome time reſided only on the tops of hills for fear of a ſecond deluge. Be that as it may, we find for certain, from the account above, that the City Troy could not have ſtood, where the Author has placed it. It was not ſituated on Mount Ida, nor upon any mountain or hill like that near Bounarbachi: nor even at the bottom of a hill: but εν πεδιῳ, at a diſtance in the Plain, and much nearer to the Grecian ſtation, than he has imagined.

[1] The Editor ſays, that *eminence of Bounarbachi*, was a part of the range of hills, which went all under the Name of Idæan Moutains.—Notes to p. 59.

Concerning the Author's ſtrictures upon Strabo.

It is ſaid by the Author concerning Strabo, that he never viſited Troas: and that he depended *upon the teſtimony of one Demetrius of Scepſis, in whom he does not ſeem to have much confidence, whom he ſometimes accuſes of contradiction, whom he finds often times differing from Homer; but whoſe deſcription he adopts for want, it ſhould ſeem, of one, that was more accurate.* p. 49. This, I think, is by no means a fair deſcription, and is introduced to the Reader under much falſe colouring. He ſpeaks of both perſons in a very harſh ſtile, and blames them for inaccuracy and miſtakes. In ſpeaking of their determination of the Scamander and Simois he uſes theſe words, *This is certainly a very obſcure and unſatisfactory explication: and Demetrius and Strabo are equally cenſurable, the one for committing the blunder, aud the other for adopting, and endeavouring to give it authenticity.* p. 59. But why does he ſuppoſe theſe learned men ſo ignorant and arraign them ſo bitterly? And what proof does he bring of their being in the wrong, except his own private opinion? It may be ſaid that he viſited the Country: ſo did they as will be ſhewn. Demetrius was a native of Scepſis, and lived upon the very ſpot in the midſt of the region Troas: and from the ſituation he (whether true or falſe) imagined the place of his reſidence to have been of old the royalty of Æneas: Strabo. L. 13. p. 905. He was an hearer of Crates and Ariſtarchus and reputed a Man of learning.

The place of his birth was by no means deſpicable: for, when learning began to be diffuſed by the Ionic School, it ſpread ſoon as far as Halicarnaſſus and Rhodus ſouth: and to Abydus, Lampſacus, and Cyzicus in the north: and men of great learning made their appearance. Of theſe Scepſis had at times its ſhare: Strabo, L. 13. p. 906. 7, mentions ſeveral philoſophers from hence: ſuch as Eraſtus, and Coriſcus of the Socratic School; and Neleus who obtained the libraries both of Ariſtotle and Theophraſtus: alſo the philoſopher Metrodorus: and the perſon, who is very improperly ſtiled by the Author—*one Demetrius*, quaſi ὁ τυχων ανηρ.

Strabo may ſometimes think differently from Demetrius; but this ſhews, that he was not blindly led by him. That he placed little confidence

fidence in him is very unwarrantably ſaid: yet it is aſſerted, that *the manner in which he* (Strabo) *endeavours to create a confidence in that Writer, ſeems to prove, that he repoſed little in himſelf.* p. 57. How then came Strabo to apply to him ſo often; and to borrow ſo much from him: above all things to ſpeak of him, as very ſafely to be truſted concerning the region of Troy.------

Εμπειρος ων των τοπων, ὡς αν επιχωριος ανηρ Δημητριος:----*as being throughly acquainted with the places mentioned, and a native of the Country?* L. 13. p. 898. The Author therefore is ſurely miſtaken in ſuppoſing that Strabo held Demetrius in *little confidence.*

The authority of this Writer is continually quoted by [1] Strabo: and he is mentioned by Stephanus of Byzantium, Harpocration, Athenæus, and other Writers. Diogenes Laertius introduces him among the twenty illuſtrious perſons of that name. He ſtiles him—[1] ωλϐσιος και ευγενης, και φιλολογος ανηρ. Notwithſtanding this he is accuſed by the Author *of contradiction:* that is, of contradicting himſelf. Otherwiſe every body that differs from another, muſt neceſſarily contradict him. The particular place referred to is in Book 13. p. 900; and precedes the paſſage above, where Strabo gives him ſo fair a character. Demetrius had been ſpeaking of ſome towns and rivers of Troas, in which he owns, that he differs from others: Strabo accordingly ſays---ταυτα μεν ουν ενϛασιν εχει τοιαυτην. By which is meant, if we truſt to the Latin verſion, Hæc ergo ſic contradicuntur,----*that theſe things imply a contradiction.* But even this is not contradicting himſelf. Beſides, this is not the ſenſe of the original, to which the Author ſhould have applied. The true meaning of the word amounts to this only, that theſe articles admit of debate: and are liable to be controverted. Hence ενϛασις is interpreted by Heſychius, ανταγωνισμα, an oppoſition, diſſent, or verbal controverſy. The purport of the ſentence ----ταυτα μεν ουν ενϛασιν εχει τοιαυτην----ſeems to be----*Theſe articles are attended with this difference and contrariety.*

1 Εκ δε της Σκηψεως και ὁ Δημητριος εστιν, ὁν μεμνημεθα πολλακις, ὁ των Τρωικων διακοσμον εξηγησαμενος, Γραμματικος. L. 13. p. 907, See alſo L. 1. p. 101.

2 See Voſſius de Scriptoribus Græcis. L. 1. c. 21, p. 133.

3 In vitâ Demetrii Phalerii. L. v. Segm. 86. p. 312.

The

The purport of Strabo's words may be learned from the context. Demetrius had written many books in order to illuſtrate Homer: and among other articles to authenticate the geographical part of his chief poem. In conſequence of this he had mentioned ſome places, which Strabo did not allow; ſuch as Allazonium, and Alube, where the Poet had ſuppoſed that there were mines of ſilver. Theſe, Strabo ſays, admitted of ſome doubt, and were liable to be diſputed. But we muſt not hence infer that he had no opinion of Demetrius. The contrary appears from his very words in the ſame page, which the Author quotes and totally diſregards, p. 57— Τἀλλα δε απολαμβανομεν, η τα τε πλειστα δειν προσεχειν, ὡς ἀνδρι εμπειρῳ και εντοπιῳ, φροντισαντι δε περι τουτων τοσαυτον, ὡστε τριακοντα βιβλους συγγραψαι στιχων εξηγησιν μικρῳ πλειονων εξηκοντα τε καταλογε των Τρωων. *In the other articles I agree with him, and think, that in moſt things he may be ſafely truſted, as being a perſon of experience, and a native of the Country; and who had conſidered theſe things ſo carefully, that he wrote a comment conſiſting of thirty Books, upon little more than ſixty verſes of Homer* (concerning the Countries and Cities mentioned) *in the Catalogue of the Trojans.* L. 13 p. 900. Who can after this with the leaſt juſtice ſay, that Strabo had no opinion of Demetrius? There is nothing intimated of his contradicting himſelf; nor of the leaſt inconſiſtency. The Author of the travels ſeems here, and in ſome other places, to put a force upon hiſtory, in order to make it applicable to his purpoſe. But truth is fixed, and inflexible, and we in vain try to warp it. It is like ſtraining a bow of ſteel the wrong way; which will certainly recoil: and probably wound the perſon, who miſapplies it.

Strabo further accuſed and acquitted.

It is more than once ſaid of Strabo, that he was never in the region of Troas: that it was a part of the world, which he had never viſited: but that he borrowed all his knowledge from Demetrius. p. 48. 49. I know not of any authority for this aſſertion. Strabo proves himſelf to have been a diligent traveller, and a curious inſpector of places. He was a native of Amaſia in Pontus; and had viſited the regions ſouthward as far

far as Egypt. And he affirms in expreſs [1] terms, that he had perſonally viewed thoſe Countries, which lay to the weſt, from Armenia, quite to Hetruria. Beſides as he came from Amaſia in Pontus, his route weſtward was almoſt in a direct line through the region of Troas. Indeed moſt perſons, who paſſed from Aſia Minor to Europe, or the reverſe, went by Troas, and Abydus. The armies of Darius, and Xerxes, though they came from the ſouth of Aſia, betook them to this part of the world in order to croſs over. And Alexander, Ageſilaus, and other Grecians, on the European ſide, made the ſame circumflex to get into Aſia. When Veſpaſian ſet out for Egypt from Athens, he took the ſame circuit, and paſſed by Abydus, and Troas. Hence we may be morally certain, that Strabo took the ſame courſe, and did not truſt implicitly to Demetrius; but in a great degree to his own experience.

But to whom could he have more juſtly truſted, than to a man of learning, and a native of the very province, of which he gave an account: and the hiſtory of which he had made his particular ſtudy. Laſtly, a perſon, who, if the Pagus Ilienſium were Troy, lived within ſight of it? for ſuch was the diſtance and ſituation of Scepſis, that it could be but a few miles diſtant from either Ilium, or any place in Troas In ſhort this Gentleman has unduly tried to ſet aſide the evidence of the two moſt unexceptionable witneſſes, that could poſſibly be produced.

1 His words are very plain and determinate.—Ερουμεν δη την μεν επελθοντες αυτοι της γης και της θαλαττης ——————————— επηλθομεν· δε επι δυσιν μεν απο Αρμενιας μεχρι των κατα Σαρδωνα τοπων της Τυρρηνιας.——— ουδε των αλλων δε ουδε εις αν ἑυρεθειη των γεωγραφησαντων πολυ τι ἡμων μαλλον επεληλυθως των λεχθεντων διαστηματων. Strabo L. 2. p. 177. We find that he ſays,——*No Geographer whatever had gone over ſo much ground in every direction, as he had traverſed.* And, if he perſonally viſited all the Countries from Armenia to Hetruria, we muſt neceſſarily among thoſe reckon Troas, as it lay the moſt obvious of any.

Strabo

Strabo accuſed of obſcurity.

It is further ſaid (p. 59.) that Strabo is not only guilty of blunders; but, that he is alſo very obſcure. But does not this ſeeming deficiency ariſe often from errors in the manuſcripts, as well as from want of attention in ourſelves; and from our not being ſufficiently acquainted with his language, and mode of writing? This, I muſt confeſs, has been often my caſe: and my doubts and miſapprehenſions have been removed by a more careful peruſal. We are likewiſe apt to ſuppoſe things obſcure, and faulty, when they do not accord with our pre-conceived notions. Thus a paſſage in Strabo, which the Author, and his learned Editor, think very wrong, appears to be quite genuine and conſiſtent. It is ſaid by Homer, that Achilles would one day be killed,—Ενι Σκαιῃσι πυλῃσι. X. 360.

But according to Dares Phrygius, and Dictys Cretenſis, he was ſlain in the Temple of Thymbræan Apollo: which opinion the [1] Author embraces. Strabo gives a deſcription of this Temple, as it was ſuppoſed to have ſtood in his time, of which however we have no intimation in Homer. He places it at the diſtance of fifty ſtadia from Ilium; which the Author thinks is not truly repreſented; and he accordingly propoſes an alteration. The paſſage is as follows.—πλησιον γαρ εστι το πεδιον ἡ Θυμβρα, και ὁ δι' αυτε ῥεων ποταμος Θυμβριος, εμβαλλων εις το Σκαμανδρον κατα το Θυμβραιε Απολλωνος Ἱερον· τε δε νυν Ιλιε και πεντηκοντα σταδιες διεχει. L. 13. p. 893.—*for near* (to the place above-mentioned) *is the plain of Thymbra; and the river Thymbrius, which runs through it, and empties itſelf into the Scamander, hard by the Temple of Thymbrean Apollo, at the diſtance of fifty ſtadia from the preſent City Ilium.* Nothing can be more intelligible than this deſcription: but it does not ſuit with the opinion either of the Author, or the Editor. They therefore think, that a full ſtop ſhould be put after Σκαμανδρον,—*The Thymbrius diſcharges itſelf into the Scamander.* The difficulty, which then ariſes, is to find out a meaning for—κατα το Θυμβραιε Απολλωνος ἱερον---which

[1] The name of the river was Thymbres, Thymbræ, and Thymbris, according to Homer, and the beſt Writers.

is deprived of its former connexion, and ſtands unſupported. The Author has found an expedient. He ſays, that *Strabo will be found to ſupport his idea, if we are allowed to make a ſmall change of the common punctuation in the paſſage, where he ſpeaks of this Temple. The Thymbrius, ſays he, diſcharges itſelf into the Scamander. If we ſuppoſe a ſtop here, we learn from the phraſe, which immediately follows, that the Temple of Apollo is to be found near the Thymbrius, at the diſtance of fifty ſtadia from New Ilium. This appears to be the true meaning of the Geographer.* p. 111. Phraſe call ye it? I hardly ever encountered ſuch a phraſe before. This ſurely is *fumum ex fulgore dare*; and the adverſe of elucidation. I wonder that his learned Friend the Editor ſhould ſupport the notion: yet he undertakes to explain it in the following manner. *It is propoſed, inſtead of the comma after* Σκαμανδρον, *to put a full ſtop: and to conſtrue what follows,* (κατα το Θυμβραιϑ Απολλωνος Ἱερον) *thus,* Το Ἱερον Θυμβραιϑ Απολλωνος εϛι κατα. *The Temple of Thymbræan Apollo, is near the banks of the river.* It is very laudable to aſſiſt a friend at a criſis: but whether any effectual help is in this inſtance afforded, I much queſtion. By this ſeparation, and abridgment, we have a mutilated part of a ſentence preſented to us, conſiſting of five words. It ſtands abſolute, without any verb, except by an arbitrary inſertion of the word εϛι, and without any thing properly predicated, and determined. Yet, by the tranſpoſition of the leading word κατα, we are to underſtand, not only a river, but the banks of a river, and the ſituation of the Temple upon that river. At the ſame time, theſe words, even as they are thus new modelled, afford not the leaſt intimation to this purpoſe. All this labour has been expended to make the Temple correſpond with the ſuppoſed ſcene of Achilles's nuptials, and death: to prove a fiction by a fable. And during the proceſs Dares Phrygius, and Dictys Cretenſis, are preferred to both Homer and Strabo.

The Author does not ſeem to know, that the Hiſtories attributed to theſe two perſons are notorious forgeries, and the characters merely ideal. He goes ſo far as to ſay, that *they were the firſt that gave an hiſtorical detail of that war, in which they themſelves had been actually engaged,* p. 40.

Concerning

Concerning a paſſage in Herodotus.

I ſhould be ſorry to be eſteemed unneceſſarily ſcrupulous; much more to be thought captious, or ſevere. Yet I know not how to agree with the Author in the interpretation of another paſſage, which he quotes from Herodotus, and ſeems totally to have miſtaken. It relates to the march of Xerxes towards the Helleſpont in his way to Greece; where it is ſaid, L. VII. C. 42. p. 530. Weſſeling: that he paſſed from the ſouth upwards through that part of Myſia, called by ſome Æolis and then—την Ιδην λαβων ες αριστερην χερα ηιε ες την Ιλιαδα γην—*keeping Mount Ida on his left hand he came into the region of Ilium.* This by the Author is rendered —*advancing towards the left branch of Mount Ida they entered the Trojan territory.* p. 43. His learned Friend, the Editor, tries to ſupport this interpretation, and ſays, *this is certainly the meaning* of—την Ιδην λαβων ες αριστερην χερα: and not—*having Ida on the left. For it was impoſſible, that the army of Xerxes marching along the coaſt from Sardis to Abydus could have Mount Ida on the left.* To me it ſeems very poſſible: and ſo it will appear to any perſon, who knows, what is meant by Mount Ida, as it was deſcribed by Homer. It appeared ſo to the Hiſtorian himſelf, who was a native of Halicarnaſſus, and muſt have been acquainted with the Country. The purport of his words are plain: and it is impoſſible, without the greateſt violation of the text, and of language in general, to ſuppoſe, that—την Ιδην λαβων επ' αριστερην χερα, can ſignify *advancing towards the left branch of Ida.* Theſe learned Gentlemen are certainly deceived in their notion about Mount Ida: and then very naturally try to make Herodotus ſpeak a language, which agrees with their conceptions. Homer often makes mention, Ιδαιων ορεων, *of the Idæan Mountains* collectively, which compoſe a long ridge from Lectum to Abydus, and ſo on to Bithynia and Thrace. Strabo L. 13. p. 873. But there was one eminence in particular near the ſea to the ſouth, which he diſtinguiſhed by the name of Ida, the ſame as Lectum, the ſummit of which was Gargarus. Hither the Poet makes the Deities often reſort to view the two armies. Below ſtood a Temple and altar, where Jupiter was worſhiped by the natives. To this moun-

tain alſo the Poet makes this Deity betake himſelf, when he left Olympus. Il. Θ. v. 47, 48.—

Ιδην δ' ἱκανεν πολυπιδακα, μητερα [illegible] θηρων.
Γαργαρον, ενθα δε οἱ τεμενος, βωμος τε θυηεις.

In another place he deſcribes the God as ſeated here, when Juno introduces Somnus, by whoſe influence Jupiter is [1] overpowered.

[illegible] κραιπνως προσεβησατο Γαργαρον ακρον
Ιδης ὑψηλης----ξ. 292.

Ida and Lectum, which were properly the ſame, formed the boundary of Troas to the ſouth weſt, which they ſeparated from Myſia Æolica. The City Gargaris, Antandros, and Adramyttium ſtood to the ſouth. Upon the ſea-coaſt below was a bay called Sinus Idæus, and Adramyttenus. Strabo. L. 13 p. 874. In the thirteenth Book of Homer it is ſaid of Neptune, that he took his ſtand upon a hill in Samothrace—

----Ὑψȣ επ' ακροτατης κορυφης Σαμȣ ὑληεσσης, v. 12.

from whence he had a proſpect of Mount Ida,

-----ενθεν γαρ εφαινετο πασα μεν Ιδη,
φαινετο δε Πριαμοιο πολις, και νηες Αχαιων.

He had alſo from hence a full view of the city of Priam, and the Grecian navy; The Iſland Samothrace lays directly oppoſite to the City Troas and to Gargarus and Lectum above it, the mountains particularly called [3] Ida. This was the eminence which Xerxes left upon his left hand, when he paſſed upwards from Sardis to Abydus. The route of his army from Lydia

1 Ὡς ὁ μεν ατρεμας ἑυδε πατηρ ανα Γαργαρῳ ακρῳ. Il. Ξ. 352.
Ιδην δ' ἱκεσθην πολυπιδακα, μητερα θηρων,—Λεκτον——Il. Ξ. v. 283.
The true Ida of Homer was Lectum; and Gaſgarus; which was the ſummit. See alſo, O. v. 152.

2 Strabo informs us, that Lectum was the Ida of the Poet——————————οικειως τȣ Ποιητȣ φραζοντος το Λεκτον, και γαρ ὁτι της Ιδης εστι το Λεκτον. L. 13. p. 874.
If Homer ſpeaks of Lectum and Gargarus as Ida proper, and Ida by way of eminence: Herodotus ſurely may be permitted to deſcribe it in the ſame manner.

3 Strabo above. St. Paul ſays,—*looſing from* Troas, we came with a ſtrait courſe to Samothracia. Acts. 16. v. 11.

northward

northward was by a paſſage between Mount Ida Gargarus and the other Idæan Mountains. It is very clearly deſcribed by Herodotus. Firſt to the river Caïcus, and Myſia. Then to the left of Mount Cane through Atarneus to Carine, and the country about Thebe by Adramyttium and Antandros. Here roſe the two ſummits called Gargarus and Lectum which compoſed the true Ida, and which ſeparated the two regions: and by theſe to the eaſt was the paſs to Troas. Xerxes therefore, when he came near to Adramyttium, and Antandros, proceeded through this paſſage,----την Ιδην λαβων εις αριστερην χειρα:---*taking Ida on his left*[1] *hand* and in this manner----πις εις την Ιλιαδα γην,---*purſued his way into the region of the Ilienſis.*

I cannot help adding, by way of corollary, that the ſituation of Troy, and of the Grecian Camp according to Homer's idea, ſeems to be in ſome degree pointed out in the paſſages above. For the Mountain Gargarus, as well as Lectum, appears plainly to be the Ida κατ' ἐξοχην, to which both the Poet and Hiſtorian refer. To this eminence Homer brings Jupiter that he may have a full view of the City and of the Ships---Ιδην δ' ικανεν----Γαργαρον;

Αυτος δ' εν κορυφησι καθεζετο κυδει γαιων,
Εισορων Τρωων τε πολιν, και νηας Αχαιων. Θ. v. 52.

He arrived at Ida Gargarus --There on the ſummit he ſeated himſelf, &c. having in full view the City of Troy, and the naval ſtation of the Grecians. Hence I am led to think, that the City of the Poet muſt have been in the ſouthern part of Troas, and at no very great diſtance from this mountain, which was the boundary of the Country downward. The camp of the Grecians muſt have been likewiſe in the vicinity upon the ſhore: and not, as generally repreſented, at the diſtance of eighteen or twenty miles to the north of Ida Gargarus with hills and promontories intervening. Virgil therefore, and thoſe, from whom he borrowed, were in the right, when they placed the City and Camp in view of Tenedos:

1 Herod. L. VII. p. 530.

1 I have ſhewn from Strabo, and from Homer himſelf, that Lectum, was the ſame as Ida, and Gargarus (ακρον) was the ſummit of Ida, and they ſtood near the ſhore. Xerxes could not enter the Regio Ilienſium without leaving them on his left hand. See Strabo L. 13. as quoted above.

Eſt in conſpectu Tenedos: for this Iſland was not far from Ida Gargarus, and Lectum, and oppoſite to Achæum, which was ſo denominated from being the ſuppoſed ſtation of the Grecian ſhips, and the place of the encampment. Strabo L. 13. p. 894. Here is the particular ſpot, from whence the ſituation of Troy to the eaſt ſhould be inveſtigated; were it poſſible to be found. And here Strabo ſought for it; but no diſcovery could be made.

Strabo again vindicated.

The Author more than once intimates, that Strabo had never viſited the region of Troas; and that all the intelligence he had, was borrowed from one perſon. But how is this known; and what evidence has the Author in proof of this article, which he ſo roundly aſſerts? He does not in the leaſt diſcloſe, by what authority he is led to frame ſo unfavourable a concluſion. What therefore he ſays ſo incautiouſly, may poſſibly come home to himſelf: and he may be in his turn blamed *for relying ſo much upon the credulity of his Readers, as to take for granted that they would adopt upon his bare aſſertion all the wonderful things, which he ſhall tell them*, p. 55. It is manifeſt from the expreſs words of this excellent Geographer, in his account of Phrygia and Troas, that he had recourſe to many celebrated Writers for information: and this he ſhews in the compaſs of a very few [1] pages. Among others he mentions [2] Theopompus, Heraclides Ponticus, Hellanicus Leſbius, Eudoxus, Lycurgus, Heſtiæus Alexandrinus, Ephorus Cyzacenus, Scylax Cariandenſis, Artemidorus, Hegeſianax, and Charon Lampſacenus, who was a native of this Country. There are others, to whom he applies, as may be ſeen in the courſe of his Writings. The Author therefore is certainly too ſevere in his treatment of Strabo, with whom he joins Mr. Wood; eſpecially, when he ſays, of the latter, *He ſeeks for a partner in misfortune, and he finds one in Strabo; who indeed is miſtaken, like himſelf, but not upon the ſpot, as he*

1 L. 1. p. 12. L. 13. p. 873.

2 The true place or name may be found in the Index of Strabo: and the names of many other Writers mentioned by him.

alledges,

alledges, for it is well known, and he ought not to be ignorant of it, that Strabo ſpeaks of the Troade only on the authority of Demetrius of Scepſis, p. 80. It is ſo far from being well known, that the contrary is the truth. The ancient Authors above mentioned ſhew it to be an unjuſt accuſation. Beſides, as I have before ſaid, to what Writer among others could Strabo more properly apply, than to a perſon of ſuch repute: who was born, and reſided in that Country, and who made the hiſtory of Troy his particular ſtudy? But to all this the Author ſeems to have been a ſtranger.

A Farther Vindication of the Grecian Geographer.

Homer places the ſource of the river Scamander at a diſtance from Troy, in the ſummit of one of the Idæan Mountains; and from the ſame mountains he makes the chief rivers of Phrygia ariſe. They run in very different directions, and he mentions their particular names. Among theſe were the Granicus, Æſepus, and Scamander.

Γρηνικος τε, και Αισηπος, διος τε Σκαμανδρος. M. v. 21.

Demetrius affords teſtimony to this, and adds, that the head of the Scamander was in a Mountain called Cotylus; and was diſtant an hundred and twenty ſtadia (near fifteen miles) from Scepſis; which was in the vicinity of Ilium. He ſays farther, that all thoſe rivers, mentioned by Homer, took their riſe from the ſame eminence. Strabo L. 13. p. 898. This account is very plain; and one would imagine, could not be controverted. But this diſpoſition of the river in the Mountain above-mentioned, and its proceeding from one fountain, does not ſeem to agree with ſome lines of the Poet in another place; and appeared to Strabo himſelf to ſtand in need of a little explanation. For the Poet tells us, that Achilles and Hector, in their courſe near the walls of Troy, came more than once to two ſprings, which are ſtyled the fountains of the Scamander: and that they iſſued from the ſame ſpot, and that one of them was a hot ſpring and the other very cold.

Κρουνω δ' ἱκανον καλλιρροω· ενθα δε πηγαι
Δοιαι αναϊσσουσι Σκαμανδρου δινηεντος.
Ἡ μεν γαρ ὑδατι λιαρῳ ῥεει, αμφι δε καπνος
Γινεται εξ αυτης ὡσει πυρος αιθομενοιο.
Ἡ δ' ἑτερῃ θερεει πρσρεει εικυια χαλαζῃ, κτλ. χ. v. 147.

Strabo very properly makes it his endeavour to conciliate these two different accounts. But, in effecting this, he has again the misfortune of incurring the censure of Mr. le Chevalier, and of his learned Friend. The former quotes at large the solution of Strabo, but disapproves of it greatly----*This*, says Strabo, *is difficult: for no warm springs are now to be found in the place; nor is the source of the Scamander there, but in the mountain: and there are not two of them, but only one. It is probable then, that the warm springs have disappeared, but the cold spring, running from the Scamander by a subterraneous passage, rises up near this place; or, because this water is hard by the Scamander, it likewise is called the fountain of the river: for in this way a river may be said to have many sources. This*, says the Author, *is certainly a very obscure and unsatisfactory explication, and Demetrius and Strabo are equally censurable, the one for his negligence in committing the blunder, and the other for adopting it, and endeavouring to give it authenticity.* p. 59. *From the latter part of the passage quoted, it is not indeed easy to collect any precise meaning; but in the preceding part Strabo is clear, and explicit in following Demetrius, who places the source of the Scamander in Mount Cotylus.* Notes p. 59. What, the least proof can be brought, that Demetrius was wrong? Yet it is insisted upon, that he was deceived, and the Editor adds—*This may be considered, as the passage, which has misled, in a greater, or less degree, almost all the modern Travellers, who have visited the Troade. Into what errors, and absurdities it contributed to lead Mr. Wood in particular will be pointed out in a subsequent Chapter.* p. 59.

I cannot be induced to think so meanly of Demetrius; who appears to me to be too severely treated, as well as Strabo; when it is said of them, that they are both equally censurable, *the one for committing the blunder, and the other for giving it authenticity*, ibid. Nor do I think, that

that the ſolution afforded by Strabo, concerning the two paſſages in Homer, is *ſo very obſcure, aud unſatisfactory.* And, whereas, the Author ſays, that *Strabo, having once admitted the doctrine of this obſerver, ſhould have endeavoured in the next place to reconcile it with the poems of Homer.* p. 58. Strabo does endeavour to make them correſpond, and in my opinion effects it very ſatisfactorily. What is extraordinary, his very words, as we have ſeen, are quoted by the Author. In the original they ſtand thus. Παρεχει δε λογον, ὡς φησιν ὁ Ποιητης.——————Ουτε γαρ θερμα νυν εν τῳ τοπῳ ευρισκεται, ουδε ἡ τȣ Σκαμανδρȣ πηγη ενταυθα, ἀλλ' ἐν τῳ ορει· και μια, ου δυο. Τα μεν ουν θερμα εκλελειφθαι εικος. το δε ψυχρον κατα διαδοσιν ὑπεκρεον εκ τȣ Σκαμανδρȣ κατα τȣτο ανατελλειν το χωριον, η και δια το πλησιον ειναι τȣ Σκαμανδρȣ, και τȣτο το ὑδωρ λεγεσθαι τȣ Σκαμανδρȣ πηγην. ὁυτω γαρ λεγονται πλειους πηγαι τȣ αυτȣ ποταμȣ. L. 13. p. 899. The Author has given of this paſſage no remote interpretation: but with ſubmiſſion I fear not ſufficiently preciſe: and as the Greek language, from the nature of its idiom, abounds with Ellipſes, ſomething muſt be ſupplied from the context, in order to give the full meaning of Strabo. I ſhall therefore venture to explain the purport of his words in the following manner. *The words of Homer, as he expreſſes himſelf, require ſome conſideration.——————For neither is there at this time any fountain of hot water in the place* (mentioned by Homer, χ. v. 147.) *nor is the ſource of the Scamander there; but above in the Mountain; and even here there are not two ſprings, but one only. It is probable that the hot ſpring no longer exiſts: and that the cold ſpring, becauſe it perhaps flowed from the Scamander by a ſubterranean paſſage, and roſe near the place alluded to, or elſe becauſe it was in the vicinity of the river, was on that account eſteemed a fountain of the Scamander. For from ſuch circumſtances many fountains may be attributed to the ſame river.* In the courſe of this reaſoning I ſee nothing unſatisfactory, or obſcure. And ſo far, in my humble opinion, is this intelligent Geographer from miſleading people, that he is the ſureſt guide, upon whom they can depend. If then it ſhould be again aſked—*How are we to reconcile theſe ſeeming contrarieties?* we may anſwer—by that juſt obſervation of Strabo at the cloſe; when he ſays, *many fountains may be attributed to the ſame river.*

Interpret the lines of Homer conformably to this obſervation, and all the ſeeming inconſiſtency, and contradiction will immediately ceaſe.

Κρηνω δ' ἱκανον καλλιῤῥοω, ενθα δε ωηγαι
Δοιαι αναϊσσεσι Σκαμανδρε δινηεντος. Il. χ. 147.

They arrived at two baſons of fine water, from which two fountains of the Scamander iſſue forth. The chief ſource of the river being in the Idæan hills, does not hinder, but that there may have been many ſubordinate ſtreams running into it in different directions. Inſtead therefore of interpreting δοιαι ωηγαι in a limited manner *the* two fountains; let the words be rendered at large,—*They came to two ſprings of the river*; two out of many, every article will be plain and conſiſtent.

They had no relation to the Scamander.

We have ſeen, that the Scamander of the Poet took its riſe among the Mountains of Ida: but the Author ſuppoſes, that the true ſource of it was at the ſprings beneath Bounarbachi. This ſituation is ſo different: that, one would think, it could never be made to agree with the former. The Editor however tries to reconcile them and make them correſpond; but I am afraid not very ſucceſsfully. He accordingly ſays, that the *Scamander might be ſaid, with ſufficient propriety to deſcend from the Idæan Mountains, as the eminence of Bounarbachi, where the ſources of that river are really to be found, was a part of the range of hills, which went all under the name of Idæan Mountains.* p. 59. I am obliged to diſſent entirely. Nothing of this ſort can be ſaid with the leaſt degree of propriety. The whole is an unavailing expedient to ſupport a weak argument. Theſe ſprings are not to be found at Bounarbachi, but a mile below in the plain; as may be proved from the Author's teſtimony in his own map. p. 115. Here he ſays, that Bounarbachi is ſituated *on an eminence at the end of a ſpacious plain.* The ſprings are a mile below, and in that plain; and far removed from any ſummit of Mount Ida. The ſource therefore of the Scamander could not be here, nor could the hill above Bounarbachi be Troy: which,

which, as I have before mentioned, was not ſituated on an eminence, but εν πεδιῳ, in a plain.

Concerning the two rivers, the Simoïs and Scamander.

Whether the poſition and courſe of the Scamander can be now aſcertained, may be uncertain: but, I think, we may be ſure, that the ſtream deſcribed by the Author, as ſuch, could never be that river. Yet he thinks, that Demetrius, Strabo, Mr. Wood, and Dr. Chandler have been in an error about the two rivers, and have miſtaken the Simoïs for the Scamander. He therefore tries to enhance the character of the ſecondary ſtream Simoïs, whoſe ſource he places below Bounarbachi, and to make it, contrary to the beſt evidence, the principal river, the true Scamander. But this notion is attended with numberleſs difficulties. For the Scamander of the Author is a very contemptible rivulet; and in its courſe downwards, cannot run above twelve miles. Whereas, the true river Scamander, which he would make the Simoïs, took its riſe in Ida, at a very great diſtance, near fifteen miles above Scepſis; and paſſed over a large tract of Country. The Author therefore puts a great force upon hiſtory, in order to maintain his notion about this river, which he ſuppoſes to be the Scamander. He owns, that it is narrow, and feeble: (p. 85.) and but fifteen feet wide, and three deep; (p. 74.) and tries to prove, that the Scamander of Homer was a tame and week ſtream from a paſſage in the Poet, (Φ. 308.) where the River-God Scamander, calls out for aſſiſtance. But this is all refinement; and affords not the leaſt ſemblance of a proof. It is quite contrary to the deſcription given by the Poet, which he overlooks. For the River, which Homer ſtiles Scamander, is repreſented as-----*δινηεις, βαθυδινηεις* (Φ. 143.) *εὔῤῥοος* (H. 329.) *εὔρειος ποταμος* (Φ. 1.) and *μεγας ποταμος βαθυδινης*. (Υ. 73. Φ. 329.) It is by Pliny mentioned as—running into the ſea and ſtyled Scamander,—*amnis navigabilis*. L. 5. p. 285. How could all this be ſaid of a brook, only *fifteen feet wide and three in depth?* The

1 Φιλε κασιγνητε, σθενος αμφοτεροι περ' Σχωμεν.

Αλλ' επαμυνε ταχιστα, και εμπιτιληθι ῥεεθρα Ὑδατος εκ πηγεων. The whole of the deſcription is apparently a poetical fiction. We cannot form an argument from apologue.

Simoïs of old joined the chief river ſomewhere high up; and was loſt in it. All below to the mouth was the Scamander, quite to the ſea. Achilles ſays to a perſon whom he had ſlain---Ουδε σε μητηρ Ευθεμενη λεχεεσσι γονησεται· αλλα Σκαμανδρος Οισει δινηεις εισω άλος ἐυρεα κολπον. Φ. 123.
He ſpeaks in the like manner of the ſame river to the Trojans.

Ουδ' ὑμιν ποταμος περ ἐϋρροος αργυροδινης Αρκεσει. v. 129.

Every article ſhews, that it was the purpoſe of the Poet to deſcribe no narrow nor feeble rivulet; but an ample ſtream; and the principal of the two rivers—ποταμος μεγας, βαθυδινης Σκαμανδρος. By theſe terms he could never mean the ſubordinate, and ignoble Simoïs. I ſay, *ignoble*, for it is ſeldom mentioned; and never with any epithet, that can give it the leaſt conſequence. Nothing at all characteriſtic is afforded, though the Poet in general abounds with epithets. Hence we may judge, in what little eſtimation it was held: and be further aſſured, that a ſtream, ſo mean, and ſo ſhort in its courſe, could not be the Scamander of Homer; nor the river of Pliny which entered the ſea. The Author therefore is wrong in making this the principal river, and ſuppoſing it to run through the Camp of the Grecians.

Farther account of the Scamander, and the ſituation of the Camp.

If we may truſt to the words of Homer, we may have from him certain proof, that the Scamander could not run through the Camp; for it was the boundary of it to the left. The ſtation of Ajax was cloſe to it, and the ultimate that way. Next to Ajax upon the coaſt downward were the ſhips of Proteſilaus: after him thoſe of Idomeneus and Neſtor. Hence it is ſaid, when Hector was engaged upon the left, of the Grecian army, that he was fighting upon the banks of the Scamander; and did not know what was going forward in the center.

----------ουδε πω Ἑκτωρ
Πευθετ', επει ῥα μαχης επ' αριστερα μαρνατο πασης;
Ορχθας παρ' ποταμοιο Σκαμανδρε----IL. Λ. v. 469.

Hector was quite ignorant of the event, for he was engaged upon the left, near the

the banks of the river Scamander. The ſhips of Achilles were to the right at the other extremity, where the Trojans never ventured. An account to the ſame purpoſe is given in another part, where Hector being at that time in the center was not appriſed of his friends being ſlain------επ' αριστερα νηων,-----*to the left of the ſhips* near the river.

Ενθ' εσαν Αιαντος τε νεες, και Πρωτεσιλαϐ,

Θιν' εφ' ἁλος ϖολιης ειρυμμεναι-----*Where the ſhips of Ajax were drawn up upon the ſea ſhore.* N. v. 675. The Poet again deſcribes Ajax in this ſituation.

---------Αιαντα μαχης επ' αριστερα ϖασης

Θαρσυνοντ' ἑταρες. P. v. 116. We find he was upon the left encouraging his ſoldiers. Here Aſius was ſlain by Idomeneus, who was ſtationed very near to Ajax:-----Εισατο γαρ νηων επ' αριστερα. M. v. 117. Whenever therefore the courſe of the Scamander can be by Authors aſcertained, we can determine the left of the Grecian ſhips; and the ſituation of the Camp may be proved according to the idea of Homer. I have mentioned, that both the river and ſhips were low down towards Alexandrea Troas, and Lectum, the ſame as Ida: which Lectum was the boundary of Phrygia Major to the ſouth, and beyond it was Antandros in Myſia. This poſition ſeems to agree well with the ſtatement afforded by ſome of the beſt Geographers of old as may be ſeen by the liſt annexed.

Ptolemy Geog. p. 137.	*Pliny*, Vol. 1. C. v. p. 282.	*Strabo*, L. 13. p. 891.
Lampſacus		
Abydus		Abydus
Dardanum		Dardanum
Simoeis	Portus Archivorum	Rhœteum
Scamander	Sigeum	Sigeum
Sigeum	Scamander	Portus Archivorum
Alexandrea Troas	Nee	Oſtia Scamandri
Lectum.	Alexandrea	Lectum.

I have

I have obſerved, that the Rhœtean and Sigean promontories were unknown to Homer : we may therefore ſet them aſide in the inſtances afforded above. All that we have to obſerve is, that according to theſe Writers, the Scamander was not far from Alexandrea, and Lectum, the ſame as Ida Gargarus. The ſhips therefore and Camp, muſt have been in the lower and ſouthern part of the region : and the City in the like ſituation, only inland.

The Author's Syſtem ſtill farther maintained by him.

Notwithſtanding theſe obſtacles, the Author thinks, that he can moſt aſſuredly aſcertain the ſituation of ancient Troy: and ſays. p. 119. *I hope, that the following ſtrict mathematical demonſtration will prove it beyond doubt. The Scæan, or weſtern Gate, was that, which faced the Plain. From this gate the Trojans iſſued out. The ſources of the Scamander lay in front, and in view of the Scæan gate. The gate was therefore to the weſt of the city. When it is once granted, that I am exact with reſpect to the ſources of the Scamander, it muſt be allowed, that I am right, as to the ſituation of the City of Troy. That this is to the eaſt of the ſources is ſtrictly and unqueſtionably demonſtrated.* I fear, that we muſt have better evidence, before we arrive at probability : and, after all, we ſhall fall far ſhort of Demonſtration. The whole is founded in ſurmiſe : and the queſtion is begged in the firſt, and eſſential, article. The Author took his ſtand upon a hill above Bounarbachi : and conceived, that here of old ſtood the city of Troy : though the ſituation is quite inconſiſtent with the poſition given by the Poet. He then formed an idea of the Scæan gate to the weſt : to which we might poſſibly ſubſcribe, if the ſituation of the city be true. But that has not been proved ; though it was the firſt article to be aſcertained. Somewhat more than a mile below this place is a hot ſpring, and at a diſtance ſome other fountains : which he ſuppoſes to be the ſources of the Scamander. In this manner he would prove the identity of the ſprings from the ſituation of the Gate and City : and the ſituation of the

1 Τα μεν συν θερμα εκλελειφθαι εικος. Strabo, L. 13. p. 89.

City

City and Gate from the poſition of the ſprings. But this diſpoſition of the objects is founded merely in fancy, and every part of the argument is deſtitute of ſupport. We have no proof, that the ancient City ſtood upon the eminence, where he has placed it: nor are there any grounds to ſuppoſe, that the different ſprings ſo far below, were the two fountains mentioned by Homer. We may be alſo aſſured, that the ſcanty brook, into which they run, was not the Scamander. Every article is not merely doubtful; but in great meaſure contradicted by the beſt hiſtories. Such a precarious ſeries of arguments will not, I fear, be readily admitted either for a ſtrict mathematical, or for a logical, Demonſtration: nor will they even ariſe to a degree of probability. In ſhort it is well known, that hot ſprings as well as cold, abounded in Phrygia, and the neighbouring regions; where the ſoil was particularly affected by ſubterraneous fires; and in conſequence of it liable to terrible earthquakes. The ſprings mentioned by Homer were not to be found in the time of Strabo, as we are by him aſſured. It is therefore in vain to look for them now: nor muſt we ſuppoſe, if a hot fountain appears, that it is neceſſarily that of the Poet. The purſuit of Achilles was throughout under the walls of the City.----Τειχεος αιεν ὑπ' ακρη; and there were the ſprings of the Poet, and not a mile and half below. Add to this, that the cold ſpring in Homer is ſingle, and the hot ſpring cloſe beſide it. But the Author inſtead of one cold fountain produces many at ſome diſtance from each other: and the hot ſpring deſcribed by him is fartheſt of all, and not much leſs than half a mile diſtant from the neareſt. All this is quite contrary to the diſpoſition mentioned by the Poet; we cannot therefore from ſuch data, determine the Scæan Gate, nor demonſtrate the ſituation of Troy.

The ſituation of the two Springs of the Poet determined by the flight of Hector.

The inveſtigation above will ſerve to throw much light upon the purſuit of Achilles, when Hector fled before. The whole of this courſe

was

was beneath the walls of the City. This is manifeſt from many paſſages in the Poet,—

-----τρεσε δ' Εκτωρ
Τειχος ὑπο Τρωων. χ. v. 43.

Hector fled in a panick beneath the Trojan Wall.
Jupiter is made to ſay——

Ω ποποι, η φιλον ανδρα διωκομενον ὑπο τειχος
Οφθαλμοισιν ορῶμαι----ασυ περι Πριαμοιο. 173.

Alaſs! I ſee a man, whom I hold dear, purſued under the wall---and about the City.——Αυτος δε ποτι πτολιος πετετ' αιει. 198.------*Hector was continually preſſing to get towards the City.*

Pallas ſays to him----

------η μαλα δη σε βιαζεται ωκυς Αχιλλευς
Ασυ περι Πριαμοιο ποσιν ταχεεσσι διωκων. v. 229.

Indeed I ſee that Achilles preſſes hard upon you in his eager purſuit about the City. In the mean time, the diſtance was ſo ſmall, that Priam and the Trojans beheld the whole, and Hector was called to by them, and implored to enter the City. The army of the Grecians was by repute an hundred thouſand men. But, if it were but forty thouſand, it muſt have extended many miles to the right, and left, and precluded all intercourſe between Troy and the plain below. The flight continued, till the two Chieftains had approached the fountains four times in their courſe— Αλλ' οτε δε το τεταρτον επι κρηνας αφικοντο, v. 208.—*but when at laſt they came a fourth time to the fountains*, then Hector was unfortunately induced to make a ſtand. Here he ventured to engage Achilles, and by theſe fountains he was ſlain. This was ſo near the City, that Priam and Hecuba beheld the whole; which they witneſſed by their ſorrow, and lamentations. v. 405. This affords farther evidence, that the fountains of Homer, from their proximity to the wall, could not be thoſe a mile and more below, and conſequently far removed from the ſpot, where it has been ſuppoſed that Troy was ſituated.

Concerning

Concerning the tradition of Hector's flight three times round Troy, and of his body when slain, dragged as often round the walls.

The learned Gentlemen, of whom I have been speaking, very justly explode this idle notion, and have made some very proper remarks upon the subject. Here Strabo is fortunately on their side; and speaking of several circumstances in the Ilias, which are difficult to be reconciled, he adds, ουδ' ἡ τε Ἕκτορος περιδρομη ἡ περι την πολιν εχει τι ευλογον. L. 13. p. 895. *Nor is the flight of Hector* (which is said to have been three times round the walls) *attended with the least shew of propriety.* He accordingly tells us, that the place, where he imagines ancient Ilium to have stood, could not, on account of an intervening hill, have been compassed in the manner supposed. When therefore Hector is made to say----

Τρις περι ασυ μεγα διεν.---χ. 251.

Three times have I fled round the great City of Priam: the principal word, upon which the whole turns, has been misunderstood. The Author therefore of the Description says, p. 135.---*I am persuaded, that the difficulty in question proceeds entirely from the way of explaining the preposition* περι, *which often signifies round, or round about; but is also used by Authors, as well as by Homer himself, to express the Latin juxta, prope, ad, or the English near beside, hard by.*

In the notes we find a number of instances to this purpose, whereby the true meaning of the word is ascertained. I agree with these learned Gentlemen entirely: and think, that the word, so far from necessarily signifying *all round*, and *in a circuit*, does not oftentimes take in both sides. A Writer therefore to express his full meaning is sometimes obliged to add the word αμφι. Hence it is said of the Grecians at Aulis,----

Ἡμεις δ' αμφι περι κρηνην ἱερας κατα βωμους
Ερδομεν Αθανατοισι τελησσασ Ἑκατομβας. Β. 305.

We sacrificed to the immortal Gods at the altar, standing round about the sacred stream. Apollonius says of the golden Fleece—

----Τοιος

-------Τοισι μιν οφις περιτ' αμφιτ' εχυται,
Λθανατος και αϋπνος. L. 2. v. 1212.

But the ſignification is particularly manifeſt, when the Trojans are deſcribed, as aſſaulting the Grecian camp with fire in their hands, in order to burn the fleet. Before the camp was a rampart, which extended acroſs the plain, and was the defence of the navy. It is ſaid, at the aſſault given by the enemy,----that the ſcene was paſt deſcribing----

Παντη γαρ περι τειχος ερωει δεσπιδας πυρ----M. 177.

Here the fire was ſo far from ſurrounding the wall, that it was only on one ſide. But when both ſides are included, then the word αμφι is often added; which circumſtance happens, when the armies are engaged both within and without.

Πολλα δε τευχεα καλα πεσον περιτ' αμφι τε ταφρον. P. 760.

Bright weapons fell all about the ditch and rampart on each ſide.
It gives me pleaſure to do, as far as I am able, juſtice to the ſagacity and judgement of theſe two learned Gentlemen.

I am, however, obliged to diſſent in one article: and cannot think, that the flight of Hector, was as they maintain, *in a circular direction*. p. 136. 7. Had the Heroes taken a large circuit, Hector muſt at times have been driven towards the wall, and have gotten between Achilles, and the City. This was certainly his endeavour, but we are told by the Poet, that he could never effect it.

Ως Εκτωρ ὁ ληθε ποδωκεα Πηλειωνα,
Οσσακι δ' ὁρμησειε πυλαων Δαρδανιδαων,
Λντιον αϊξασθαι ευδμητας επι Πυργας,
Ειπως ὁι καθυπερθεν αλαλκοισιν βελεεσσι,
Τοσσακι μιν προπαροιθεν αποστρεψασκε παρασας
Προς πεδιον γ', αυτος δε ποτι πτολιος πετετ' αισι. χ. v. 193, 4, &c.

Troy, we know, was ſuppoſed to have ſeven gates. To ſome of theſe gates Hector tried to make his way; but the poet tells us, that his purpoſe

purpoſe was always defeated. *He could not deceive Achilles: for, as often, as he made an effort to get near to one of theſe gates, in order to be protected by his friends above, ſo often did Achilles get before him and turn him towards the plain.* Hence I conjecture that their courſe could not be in *a circular direction*; but irregular, and often interrupted, being carried on with dodging, and evaſion. Indeed, if the flight was, as is generally ſuppoſed, in a high road, it is manifeſt that could not be circular. But this demands ſome conſideration.

It is ſaid, at the beginning of Hector's flight, that he left the Scæan gate, where he at firſt had taken his ſtation, and ſped away, not daring to meet Achilles.

------τρεσε δ' Εκτωρ
Τειχος υπο Τρωων, λαιψηρα τε γυιατ' ενευμα.

Achilles immediately purſues him, and they both preſs forward under the wall of the City, and in the great high road.

Τειχεος αιεν υπ' εκ κατ' αμαξιτον εσσευοιτο. χ. 143.
αμαξιτον, αμαξηλατον οδον. Schol.—*the way, which waggons went.* As Troy is ſaid to have had ſeven gates, there was undoubtedly a road from each of them, which led into different parts of the Country. If then they were both in the ſame road, as is repreſented, Hector muſt either have been forced into the Country, which we know was not the caſe; or elſe been driven towards the City. But it is hardly credible, that Achilles ſhould be repreſented as preſſing him in his flight towards the Towers and walls: for it was the very thing, which the one wiſhed for, and the other ſtrove to prevent. As often as Hector made an effort that way—τοσσακι μιν προπαροιθεν αποστρεψασκε φαρασσε προς πεδιον.---χ. 196. *ſo often did Achilles get before him, and ſtood between him and the wall, and turned him again towards the plain, and Country.* This has ſometimes made me think that another ſolution may be given to the Poet's words. For a circular flight could not have been maintained in a high road.

HAMAXITUS.

Though by αμαξιτος, amaxitus, has been generally underſtood a road, or high way, even as far back as the writing of the Scholia, yet I have often thought, that it was a proper name, and related to a City of Troas. It lay very near to the Pagus Ilienſium, where Demetrius and Strabo ſuppoſed Troy to have ſtood, and not far from Scepſis, but to the ſouth. They were all in the vicinity of Lectum, or Ida proper; which ſtood near, and upon the ſea. Homer expreſſes the name Amaxitus without an aſperate, whereas all the Writers of Hellas uniformly prefixed that ſpirit. But this is of little conſequence: for the Cities of Troas were peopled by the Æolians from Cuma: and the whole region belonged to them from the Hermus to Abydus north, and even to Cyzicus, as we learn from Strabo. L. 13. p. 877. He ſays in conſequence of it, that Troas and Æolis were the ſame, the one being a part of the other. ibid. Now the Æolians were remarkable for leaving out the aſpirate. *Æoles aſperum ſemper vertunt in tenuem, quem ob id H. Stephanus Æolicum vocat, ipſoſque Æolas* ψιλωτικους. *Euſtathius. Jacobus Zuingerus de Dialectis.* They pronounced ηλιος for ἡλιος: ημερα for ἡμερα: conſequently Amaxitus for Hamaxitus. Homer therefore very properly writes the name, as the natives pronounced it, but others prefix the aſperate. Stephanus Byzantinus takes notice of the place, as a ſmall City or Town.—Ἀμαξιτος πολιχνιον της Τρωαδος. Pliny alſo ſpeaks of it, and deſcribes it as the firſt place, which occurred in Troas, in coming from Myſia; and the cities of Æolis, which were to the ſouth. At the ſame time, he gives a preciſe account of the places near it. *Troadis primus locus Hamaxitus, dein Cebrenia, ipſaque Troas, nunc Alexandrea: Oppidum Nee: Scamander amnis navigabilis, et in promontorio quondam Sigeum oppidum, in quem fluit* [1] *Xanthus Simoenti junctus, ſtagnumque faciens Palæſcamander.—Eſt tamen et nunc Scamandria Civitas parva: ac M D paſſus remotum a portu Ilium immune.* Vol. 1. L. 5. p. 282. Strabo mentions Hamaxitus as being ſituated near Lectum, or Ida proper. —ἡ Αμαξιτος, ἡ τῳ Λεκτῳ ὑποκειμενη συνεχης. L. 13 p. 901.

1 The Xanthus was the upper part of the Scamander.
Οι Ξανθον καλουσι θεοι, ανθρωποι δε Σκαμανδρον.

When

When therefore it is ſaid by Homer

Τειχεος αιεν ὑπ' ακρ κατ' Αμαξιτον εσσευοντο.

The meaning is, that the two Heroes in the beginning of their career bent their way beneath the wall in the direction towards Hamaxitus. Hector, as often as he was intercepted from gaining the wall, ſtopped ſhort and doubled; and ſo returned the ſame way back. The Poet makes uſe of this place as a land mark to ſhew in what direction they at firſt ſped. At all rates we may perceive, that the Troy of Homer was low down, and in the ſouth weſt part of Troas, not far from Mount Lectum. If it ever exiſted, it muſt be looked for here. And we may perceive from the words of Pliny, that Hamaxitus was the firſt place, that occurred in Troas to a perſon, who entered the Country by the road of Xerxes leaving Ida on the left hand. For this was the grand road for thoſe, who journeyed from the ſouth; and was formed by a paſſage through the mountains. Mount Ida proper being to the left, and the Bithynian, or Idæan Mountains to the right.

Of the ſuppoſed Tombs of Grecian Wariors near Troy.

The Author with a pleaſing enthuſiaſm ſpeaks of the mound of earth, which he ſaw in Troas, as the real Tombs of perſons, to whom they were attributed by the Grecian Writers. But the true ſite of Troy was never aſcertained, nor of the Camp of the Grecians: the latter of which ſome have placed oppoſite to Thrace; and others far lower down upon the Helleſpont. The [1] Phrygians and Myſians, a [2] Thracian people, were the firſt, who ſettled upon this coaſt. It was their cuſtom to raiſe [3] barrows over their dead: and there is reaſon to think, that thoſe mentioned here by Strabo, Pliny, and other Writers, were the work of theſe

1 Οἱ Μυσοι, Θρακες οντες. ——— Οἱ Φρυγες ——— Θρακιον το εθνος. Strabo, L. 7. p. 453. L. 10. p. 722. Τα παρ' Αξυδον Θρακες (επωκησαν) L. 13. p. 877. C.

2 Τα περι των Φρυγων, και των Μυσων, λεγομενα πρεσβυτερα των Τρωικων εστι. ibid. L. 12. p. 858.

3 Herodotus mentions the manner of their burying their dead——χωμα χεαντες, *by* raiſing a mound of earth, or barrow, over them. L. 5. C. 8. p. 375.

nations.

nations. The Trojan names of places were in great meaſure [1] Thracian. When, many ages after the ſuppoſed æra of Troy, the writings of Homer came to be publickly known, the Grecians, as ſoon as they got acceſs to the regions of Phrygia, tried to make every object, which they ſaw there, accord with the hiſtory of the poem: but were in a continual ſtate of [2] contradiction. They determined at hazard, and accommodated every thing to their own fancy. They firſt preſent us with the tomb of Memnon near the Æſepus, many miles above Troy, [3] ὑπερ της εκβολης της Αισηπε ----Μεμνονος ταφος. Next we find two ſeparate tombs of [4] Achilles, and Patroclus; and at ſome diſtance another of [5] Antilochus: who, according to Homer, were all buried together. The aſhes of Achilles and Patroclus were mixed, and in the ſame urn: thoſe of Antilochus apart, but in the ſame tomb.

Μιγδα δε Πατροκλοιο Μενοιτιαδαο θανοντος, χωρις δ' Αντιλοχοιο Ω. 77 Odyſſ.

I believe, there is no inſtance of three perſons, who where buried in the ſame mound, having additionally three ſeparate Tombs raiſed for them in the ſame place.

After the demolition of Troy, Agamemnon is ſaid to have collected his booty, and his captives, among which was Hecuba and to have ſailed directly homeward. Of this we have an account Odyſſ. Δ. v. 512. But there was a monument in Thrace, called κυνος σημα, which the Grecians interpreted—*the monument of the dog*, and feigned, that it was the tomb of Hecuba, tranſformed to that animal. But Cunoſema was a promontory above Sigeum conſiderably, and on the oppoſite coaſt of the Helleſpont. Strabo L. 13. p. 889. Whither Hecuba, as far as we can learn from Homer, was never tranſported: for Agamemnon is ſuppoſed to have carried her directly to Greece.

1 Πολλαι δ' επωνυμιαι Θρᾳξι και Τρασιν.——Οιον Σκαιοι, Θρᾳκες, και Σκαιος ποταμος,—και εν Τροιῃ Σκαιαι πυλαι. Strabo L. 13. p. 883.——Σκαιοι, εθνος Θρᾳκικον. Heſych.—The ſame affirmed. L. 13. p. 872.

2 Ουδεν ὁλως αλληλοις ὁμολογουντες. Strabo L. 13. p. 873.

3 Strabo L. 13. p 878.

4 Strabo L. 13. p. 891. See Ptolemy Geog. p. 117.

5 Πατροκλε και Αντιλοχε μνημα. ibid.

In

In like manner there was a barrow upon the ſame coaſt of Thrace, where Proteſilaus was ſuppoſed to have been buried. This Hero was killed by Hector upon the firſt landing of the Grecians at Troas: and it is natural to ſuppoſe, that he was buried, where he fell. But we find him on the contrary depoſited higher up and upon the oppoſite ſhore of the Helleſpont; and in an enemy's country. For the Thracians of the Cherſoneſus were allies of the [1] Trojans, and came to their aſſiſtance under the command of Mentes. But, if they had been friends of the Grecians, yet why ſhould the body of this Hero, of all others, have been carried from the place, where he fell? How uncertain theſe accounts are, we may learn from Virgil, who, as well as Euripides, mentions that the Thracians were not enemies, but allies of the Trojans; and that their King Polymeſtor was a particular friend of Priam. They ſay alſo, that this King murdered Polydorus, the youngeſt ſon of his Trojan Ally; and buried him under a barrow. But, if we may believe Homer, Polydorus was not murdered by Polymeſtor, nor ever in Thrace: and conſequently had no ſuch tomb. He was killed by Achilles, as may be ſeen at large—Υ. v. 407, &c.----Whom then are we to believe? Virgil and Euripides? or Homer? I leave the reader to chooſe [1]. I ſhall only obſerve, that the hiſtory of theſe tumuli is precarious: and has been determined at random by the later inhabitants of the Country. For theſe mounds of earth were ancient Thracian barrows, founded prior to the æra of Troy; but appropriated by the Grecians long afterwards to people of their own nation, juſt as fancy directed. Hence we find ſome in Aſia, ſome in Europe: ſome in Troas, ſome above it, widely ſeperated; all which, according to the hiſtories afforded, ſhould have been limited to the ſame ſpot, if they had belonged to people who fell at Troy.

1 Some have tried to remedy this contradiction by ſuppoſing the Polydorus of Homer to have been by another mother. Polydorus was the name of one and the ſame perſon, the youngeſt ſon of Priam; whoſe hiſtory has been differently told, and in a manner quite contradictory.

A vindication of Clemens Alexandrinus.

The Author quotes too boldly; and incautiouſly applies to Writers, with whom he ſeems not to have been ſufficiently acquainted. He ſays, p. 50. *I ſhould not be ſurpriſed to find, that after the eſtabliſhment of Chriſtianity the temples and tombs of ancient Warriors had been conſigned to oblivion.* I ſhould have been equally ſurpriſed, if they had not: for how could it be expected, that Chriſtians ſhould pay any attention to them? But to proceed—*It is univerſally known, with what zeal Clemens Alexandrinus oppoſed this ſpecies of idolatry, and how vehemently he inveighed againſt the firſt Chriſtians for laviſhing upon theſe numerous tombs that incenſe, which was only due to the* [1] *Deity*, p. 50. The zeal of Clemens would have been very laudable, if it had ſhewn itſelf upon ſuch an occaſion, to prevent any ſuperſtitious obſervance. But what is mentioned *as univerſally known* is univerſally unknown. Not one word is to be found, in the place referred to, of the Chriſtians laviſhing incenſe; nor of their paying the leaſt regard to tombs. I never knew a more palpable miſtake, or a more bold and injurious aſſertion. Had Dr. Pococke, or Chandler been guilty of ſuch a groundleſs accuſation, the Author would have given them no quarter. The firſt Chriſtians never diſgraced their religion by ſuch idolatrous practices. And it is a very unjuſt imputation, which is thus brought upon them. The learned Father's addreſs is to the Gentiles, whom he wanted to convert. For them the whole Cohortatio was compoſed; whom the Author of the Deſcription has taken for Chriſtians. He has accordingly accuſed them of making offerings at the very tombs, which they held in abhorrence. Numbers laid down their lives to avoid any guilt of this kind. The paſſage, to which the [2] Author refers us, is by his own account in the Cohortatio of Clemens, and in his third Chapter. Edit. Potter. Mention is there made, and throughout the whole Diſſer-

[1] The Author's manner of reaſoning is ſomewhat uncommon. If what he ſays, were true, how could he expect the Chriſtians to conſign theſe tombs to oblivion, if they entertained an idolatrous veneration for them? Under ſuch circumſtances, the wonder would have been, if they had neglected them. But the whole is ſurpriſe without any object of wonder.

[2] See Deſcription, &c. P. 50.

tation,

tation, of the objects of idolatry maintained of old by different Gentile Nations: and the abſurdity of the worſhip is very properly expoſed. But, as I ſaid before, the name of Chriſtian is not to be found in any part of the Chapter, to which he appeals. The whole is addreſſed to Grecian idolaters, and relates to the ancient worſhip of the Country, which they ſtill maintained. This imputation concerning the firſt Chriſtians is very raſh and groundleſs. There is nothing in any part of the Cohortatio to this purpoſe.

Some wrong intimations.

The Author in the ſame place adds, by way of queſtion, the lines following. *Why did not the* (Chriſtian) *Prieſts of the lower empire demoliſh theſe monuments? Why did they leave a ſingle trace of them behind? It was becauſe they were well acquainted with the veneration, entertained by the Greeks for the Sepulchres of the dead: and perhaps they could not have deviſed a more effectual method of bringing them back to their ancient worſhip, and of* [1] *alienating them from the new, than to attempt to violate the tombs of Warriors.* p. 50.

He is ſpeaking of the Greeks of the lower Empire and in proof of what he aſſerts, he refers to Diodorus Siculus, Vol. 1. L. 13. p 610. Edit. Weſſeling. This, when I firſt ſaw it, ſeemed the ſtrangeſt reference, that ever was made. For what poſſible proof, or even illuſtration, concerning the mode of acting among the Chriſtians of the lower Empire can be obtained from a Writer, who wrote before Chriſtianity commenced; and even before the its great Author was born? What is ſtill more extraordinary, when we examine the paſſage, it has not the leaſt relation to Greece, nor to the worſhip paid there at Tombs; but, ſtrange to tell, to Annibal Rhodius, and the Carthaginians; and to an æra as far back as the 93d. Olympiad, 400 years before Chriſt. Mention indeed is there made of

1 This could not poſſibly be true according to his own aſſertions. What fears could the Chriſtians entertain about the people lapſing again into this ſpecies of Idolatry, if the prieſts practiſed it themſelves from the beginning, and if you will believe him, offered incence at theſe very tombs. But the whole is a ſeries of miſtakes. See page 50 of his work.

monuments deſtroyed, and of a religious fear, in conſequence of it. Alſo of a Tomb ſtruck by lightning: when the people are ſaid to have been much alarmed. But this has not the leaſt connexion with Greece, and the lower Empire, nor with the worſhip then in uſe; which was above ſeven hundred years later.

When the Author ſpeaks of the Church in the time of the Emperors, and ſays, that the Prieſts knew the veneration, in which the people held the Tombs of their Warriors, and therefore did not preſume to demoliſh them, the whole is a ſuppoſition without any authority. There is not the leaſt reaſon to ſuppoſe, that the Prieſts had any ſuch apprehenſions, or the people any ſuch attachment. It is likewiſe too great a refinement to imagine, that the removal of the object would be the cauſe of adoration. Chriſtianity, which he ſtyles new, had been for ſome Centuries introduced, and was by law eſtabliſhed. And ſo far were the Prieſts in theſe times from apprehending any ill conſequences from theſe tombs, that they did not regard them with the leaſt notice. And inſtead of offering incenſe upon them, as has been wrongly ſuppoſed, both Prieſts and people lapſed into a ſimilar mode of idolatry, and made offerings at the tombs of their own Saints, and Martyrs. This precluded all worſhip, and reverence, at the ſepulchres of Deities and Heroes. As to the notion about deſtroying them, the early Chriſtians had no power to effect it; and the later no inclination. They did not think them of the leaſt conſequence.

There is ſomething in the allegation above the moſt extraordinary, that I ever encountered Writers generally, when they are inclined to find fault, direct their cenſure towards ſomething which has been done. The Author acts the very reverſe, and founds his cenſure upon what has not been done; and calls people to account, who are confeſſedly quite blameleſs: and from what they did not do, he infers, what they would have done, could they have had their will. All this is levelled at the early Chriſtians: for which Chriſtians, and for Chriſtianity itſelf, I hope, he has more regard, than he ſeems to ſhew by taking ſuch unneceſſary and indirect means to defame them.

Of

Of PAUSANIAS.

The Author, p. 48, ſpeaks of Pauſanias as *one of the greateſt Geographers among the Ancients*. But Pauſanias was no more a Geographer, than Plot, Dugdale, Leland, or Lambard among us. He was properly an Antiquary, who confined his obſervations to Greece: with the reſt of the world he was little concerned. His purpoſe was to take notice of the principal cities within the Peloponneſus, and without: and to deſcribe the ancient Temples, rites, and Deities: alſo the ſtatues and pictures, fountains and groves, with the little hiſtories, by which they were illuſtrated. The Author mentions it likewiſe as *a ſurpriſing circumſtance, that Pauſanias never viſited the Troad*, p. 48. Whether he did or not, is of little conſequence: and either way no object of ſurpriſe. At the ſame time, I know not by what authority, the Author is determined, when he makes this aſſertion. Beſides how was Pauſanias at all concerned with Troy? I do not believe, that the name occurs once in all his work. And, if there be any alluſion to the City under the name of Ilium, it is always brief, and introduced incidentally: as the hiſtory of that place was quite foreign to his purpoſe. The whole of his views were confined to Hellas: and not extended to the World in general. The portion of the earth, with which he was concerned, is ſcarcely three degrees ſquare. It is therefore as wrong to ſtile Pauſanias *one of the greateſt Geographers of the ancients*, as it is to call Strabo *a blunderer*.

Concerning ſome ſtrictures, with which I am noticed.

I wiſh that the Author for his own ſake had paſſed me by unregarded: for I find my name introduced among thoſe of other Writers, whom he has been unduly led to cenſure. In the deſcription of the Tumuli in Troas, a paſſage is brought from my Analyſis of Grecian Mythology, in which the Author thinks that I have been greatly miſtaken, and gone contrary to every Writer upon the ſubject. He accordingly quotes my words

at large, and then paſſes ſentence upon them. What I had unfortunately advanced, was as follows. Mention had been made, that the Tumuli in Egypt were ſtyled Tapha: of which many inſtances were produced; and for this a reaſon was given. For—*the Natives were obliged to raiſe the ſoil, on which they built their Edifices, in order to ſecure them from the inundation of the Nile; and many of their ſacred Towers were erected upon conical-mounds of earth. But there were often hills of the ſame form conſtrued for religious purpoſes; upon which there was no building. Theſe were very common in Egypt. Hence we read of Taph-hanes, Taph-Oſiris, Taph-Oſiris parva, and Contra Taphus, in Antoninus. In other parts were Taphiuſa, Tape, Taphuſa, &c. &c. But as it was uſual in ancient times to bury perſons of diſtinction under heaps of earth formed in this faſhion, theſe Tapha came to ſignify Tombs: and almoſt all the ſacred mounds raiſed for religious purpoſes were looked upon as monuments of deceaſed Heroes. The Greeks ſpeak of numberleſs ſepulchral monuments, which they have thus interpreted. They pretended to ſhew the Tomb of Dionuſus at Delphi: alſo of Deucalion, Pyrrha, and Orion in other places. They imagined, that Jupiter was buried in* [1] *Crete:* Upon this the Author animadverts, and ſays.—*Mr. Bryant here endeavours to prove, that the Greeks were miſtaken in ſuppoſing, what were ſacred mounds to be tombs of Heroes.* I muſt beg to be excuſed: for what I ſaid with limitation, and as happening occaſionally muſt not be introduced, as a general and uniform opinion or practice. Such an inference is unjuſt; and contrary to my expreſs words. He proceeds. *But the concurring teſtimony of Homer, and all antiquity is ſufficient to convince us, that they had no other way of preſerving their aſhes than by depoſiting them under theſe hillocks.* p. 89. How does this in the leaſt prove, that there were not tumuli erected for another purpoſe? At the ſame time how can it with any degree of plauſibility be ſaid, that the Grecians had no other way of preſerving the aſhes of perſons deceaſed, than by depoſiting them in the manner mentioned? Had they not Temples, publick buildings, Mauſolea,—Μνημεια, Οβελισκοι, Στηλαι, under which people were buried? We read of Tombs of exquiſite

1 Other inſtances to a great amount might have been brought from Lycophron, Pauſanias, and other Writers.

workmanſhip,

workmanſhip, ξεσοι λιθοι, ξεσοι ταφοι, ξεσαι πετραι. What is extraordinary the aſhes of Homer, according to the Author's own opinion, are preſerved in a Sarcophagus of ſtone. That they buried people under heaps of earth was never by me denied: to which the Author has not duly attended: and from a particular mode of burial would infer a general uſage. His learned Friend has brought a variety of proofs to ſhew, that not only the Grecians, but people long ſince have interred perſons of conſequence under mounds of earth: and he might have added people of no conſequence, as every Church Yard will witneſs. but this does not affect me; and is therefore quite unneceſſary: for it is what I always allowed, as may be ſeen by the very words, which the Author quotes from me. For I mention, in the moſt unequivocal terms, *that it was uſual in ancient times to bury people of diſtinction under heaps of earth formed in this faſhion.* The authorities brought in oppoſition prove my words: But, however numerous they may be, and however they may ſhew, that people were buried under ſuch tumuli; yet they do not prove, that there were no ſuch mounds, where people were not buried, and which were erected for another purpoſe. For this, if it were neceſſary, I could bring evidence in abundance. How can we ſuppoſe that a ſacred mound dedicated to Bacchus, Jupiter, Ceres, Orion, Deucalion, Pyrrha, or any other of thoſe fabled perſonages, was a real place of burial, though called [1] τυμβος. There were many ſuch Tumuli in Egypt and Arabia, ſtyled tombs of [2] Oſiris. But can we ſuppoſe, that one and the ſame perſon was buried in ſo many different places. Beſides the Egyptians, as we are told, eſteemed Oſiris as the Sun: and, Iſis as the moon. At other times a plaſtick nature, φυσις; by which all things were produced. However

1 We meet with many places of worſhip under this name.
Τυμβος Ἡρας ὁπλισμιας. Lycophron. v. 613.
Τυμβος, aram. Potter. v. 335.
Τυμβος (Μαντειον) Lycoph. 1050.
Mercurii Theutatis Tumulus. Livy. L. 26.
Ἠδη ὑπερ πολιος, ὁθι Ἑρμαιος Λοφος εστι. Odyſſ. Π. v. 471.
Ἑρμαιος Λοφος εις τιμην του Θεου. Heſych.
Inſtances without number might be brought from Diodorus, and Pauſanias, as well as from other Hiſtorians.

2 Diodorus. L. 1. p. 23. C.

them

then the Grecians might misinterpret these Tumuli, and represent them as Sepulchres: the Natives of Egypt thought very differently. They never conceived, that the sun could be concealed in a hillock, or Nature be buried in a barrow.

What is extraordinary, after it has been asserted, and a long process carried on in the notes, to shew, that *the concurring testimony of Homer, and all antiquity, prove me to be greatly mistaken*, in supposing, that some of these Tumuli were raised for a religious purpose; the Author seems to forget himself in the space of five lines; and says—*some few of them might be particularly consecrated to the ceremonies of religion*. p. 92 But this is shifting quicker than a weather-cock, and ruins all that has been asserted. He allows me the very article, which he had before denied me, and maintains, what he had just controverted. In short he has kept up an opposition, where we are both agreed.

This perhaps may appear of no great consequence: yet after all it is trifling with characters, which a noble and ingenuous mind should be very cautious of arraigning. We ought to consider well, before we found our own reputation upon anothers ruin: and at all rates we should have truth on our side.

Conclusion and Apology.

I have been carried on, in the course of these observations contrary to my general plan of study, being for the most part engaged in pursuits of a more serious nature. But I thought, it would be an act of justice to soften those severe censures, of which the Author of the Description, through too great a zeal for his system, has unwarily been guilty. Indeed it is the duty of all persons, who have opportunity and power, to retrieve the characters of those, to whose learning and merit they have been beholden: and to take off any undue impressions. This I have endeavoured to effect in favour of Dr. Chandler, and others: and, I hope, it is executed in a manner, that cannot give any just offence. Though, if I had acted

ted differently I ſhould have the Author's ſanction for my mode of proceeding. For he ſays, p. 75. *When in open contempt of every guide, we wander far away from the truth, we then forfeit all title to mercy: and become obnoxious to the rigour of criticiſm.*

I likewiſe imagined, that a diſquiſition of this kind might in ſome degree illuſtrate the purpoſe of Homer, and determine the Geography of his Poem, as far as it can be aſcertained. There are certainly ſome ſeeming inconſiſtences in the Ilias, and ſubſequent Poem, which it may not be eaſy to reeoncile. For, as I have in another place obſerved, a fable of any length will never be conſiſtent: and I look upon theſe poems of Homer concerning the expedition of the Greeks, and the rape of Helen, to be mere fables. I am perſuaded, that no ſuch war, as has been repreſented, was carried on againſt Troy: nor do I believe, that the Phrygian City, ſo zealouſly ſought after, ever exiſted. For this I could bring very cogent proof, ſhould ſuch a diſquiſition be at all acceptable to the World.

ERRATA.

Introduction, Page iii. l. 3. after Chevalier *dele* comma.
Page 3. l. 16. *for* Scean, *read* Scæan.
—— 4. l. 20. *for* Sigæan, *read* Sigean.
—— 10. l. 9. *for* ὁμοδον, *read* ομοδοι.
—— 15. l. 28. *for* Metrodosus, *read* Metrodorus.
—— 25. l. 29. *after* they issued, *add* both.
—— 37. l. 7. *after* that *add* it.
—— 41. l. 9. *for* seperate, *read* separate.